DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 001 SP 005 993

TITLE	Final Report on the Second Year of the Cooperative Internship Program for Community College Instructors, 1970-71.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Berkeley. School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Higher Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Coll. Support.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	196p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	College Teachers; *Community Colleges; Cooperative Programs; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Internship Programs; *Preservice Education; *Teacher Education; Teacher Interns
IDENTIFIERS	CIP; *Cooperative Internship Program

ABSTRACT

This report describes the second year of operation of the Cooperative Internship Program for Community College Instructors (CIP), 1970-71. Objectives, program operation, evaluation, and conclusions are presented in detail. Emphasis is placed on three phases of activities: placement, preservice, and in-service. Preservice activities covered video-taping and playback, curriculum, methodology, group interaction, and experienced faculty participation. In-service activities included seminars, workshops, an interpersonal learning weekend, and field visits. Program evaluation was based on experienced faculty evaluation of interns, deans' of instruction evaluation of interns, student evaluation of interns, intern evaluation of CIP, and the Omnibus Personality Inventory. Conclusions cover major strengths, and weaknesses of the program, program problems, and recommendations for program development. Tables and appendixes with related program material are included. (MJM)

ED 072001

FINAL REPORT

On the Second Year of the Cooperative Internship Program For Community College Instructors, 1970-71

University of California, Berkeley

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

June, 1971

SP 005 993

submitted to

Dr. Paul H. Carnell, Assistant Director
Division of College Support
Bureau of Higher Education
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Chester H. Case, Jr.
Director, Cooperative Internship Program
5633 Tolman Hall
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

PREFACE

This is the report of the second year of operation of the Cooperative Internship Program for Community College Instructors (CIP). It is organized to conform with the "Director's Evaluation Report and Participant Evaluation Forms." In keeping with Paul H. Carnell's enjoinder that "these documents are not intended to provide in-depth evaluation of each training program," this report does not attempt scientific evaluation. The prevailing tone is descriptive and analytical.

Attention is devoted to the more salient aspects of the Cooperative Internship Program. It is hoped that the hard earned experiences of the CIP's two years may, through this report, be of value to those who may be of a mind to launch an innovative approach to instructor preparation.

This report is concerned with the second year of CIP operation. Redundancies with the report of the first year 1969-70 have been minimized, though comparisons have from time to time been useful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Preface.....i

I. Basic Information.....1

II. Objectives.....2
Program Objectives.....2
Objectives for the Interns as Individuals.....3
Objectives for the Cooperating Colleges.....3
Educational Need to Which the CIP was Addressed.....6
Emphases in Training.....6

III. Program Operation.....9
Participants.....9
Selection Criteria.....9
Commentary on Selection Criteria.....12
Faculty-Participant Ration.....14
Staff Patterns.....14
  The CIP Team.....15
  The Experienced Faculty Member.....18
  Lecturers, Consultants, Guest Speakers.....21

Activities.....24
  Phase I: Placement.....24
  Phase II: Pre-Service.....28
    Program of Activities.....29
    Video-taping and Playback.....29
    Curriculum.....30
    Methodology.....31
    Group Interaction.....31
    EF Participation.....32
    Commentary on the Pre-Service Phase.....32
    Duration and Beginning and Ending Dates.....33
  Phase III: In-Service.....33
    Saturday Seminars.....34
    Pajaro Dunes Workshop/Seminar on Faculty Development.....35
    Interpersonal Learning Weekend.....38
    Field Visits.....38
    Commentary on the In-Service Phase.....39
    Duration and Beginning and Ending Dates.....40

Page

IV. Evaluation..41
Objectives Relating to Placement..........................41
Objectives Relating to the Colleges and EFs................42
Objectives Relating to Interns............................42
Evaluation Discussion..................................43
EF Evaluation of Interns...............................45
Deans of Instruction Evaluation of Interns.............48
Student Evaluation of Interns..........................58
Intern Evaluation of the CIP..............................67
Use of the Omnibus Personality Inventory..................72
Description and Evaluation of the Pajaro Dunes Group Process Weekend.......................................73
Goals of the Evaluation Project........................74
Outline of the Weekend.................................76
What Happened..78
Evaluation...80
Conclusions..87

Long Range Evaluation.....................................88

V. Conclusions..89

Major Strengths and Weaknesses of the Program..............91
Problems that Deserve Attention Because They Have Not Been Solved.......................................93
Recommendations for Program Development...................94

TABLES

Page

1. Intern's Ranking of Areas of Program Focus for Value in Professional Development.....7a
2. Volume and Disposition of Applications, 1970-71.....9a
3. Experienced Faculty (EF) Evaluation of Interns on All Around Performance Using Other First Year Instructors as the Reference Group for Comparison.....46a
4. Dean of Instruction Evaluation of the Intern Using Other Instructors Who Have Taught at the College the Same Length of Time as the Reference Group for Comparison.....48a
5. Student Evaluation: Intern 02.....52
6. Student Evaluation: Intern 03.....53
7. Student Evaluation: Intern 04.....54
8. Student Evaluation: Intern 05.....55
9. Student Evaluation: Intern 06.....56
10. Student Evaluation: Intern 07.....57
11. Student Evaluation: Intern 10.....58
12. Student Evaluation: Intern 11.....59
13. Student Evaluation. Intern 12.....60
14. Student Evaluation: Intern 13.....61
15. Student Evaluation: Intern 15.....62
16. Student Evaluation: Intern 16.....63
17. Student Evaluation: Intern 17.....64
18. Interns as a Group; Mean of the Means for Each Item.....65
19. Intern's Rating of Selected Program Characteristics; Participant Evaluation Forms, OE Form 1216.....71

APPENDICES

Page

A. List of 1970-71 Interns: Placement and Assignment..................96

B. Application Procedures: Cooperative Internship Program 1970-71..100

C. CIP Staff Roster...108

D. List of Experienced Faculty Members, with College and Intern.......110

E. Publicity Materials..113

F. Curriculum Development Assignment.................................117

G. Materials for Planning and Program for a Saturday Seminar..........119

H. Materials for the Pajaro Dunes Workshop/Seminar in Faculty Development...130

I. Fiedler: Evaluation Report on the Pre-Service Institute, 1969.....148

J. Instruments for Evaluation of Interns............................174

K. Interview Protocols; Evaluation of Process Weekend................179

L. Summary: Participant Assessment of 1970-71 CIP Group Process Training Weekend...182

M. Participant Evaluation Forms, OE Form 1216........................184

I. BASIC INFORMATION

A. Name and address of the institution:

University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, California 94720

B. Name of institute or special project:

Cooperative Internship Program for Community College Instructors

Program number 69-0725; Grant number 9 NIH #45-1470

C. Director's name, address and telephone number:

Chester H. Case, Jr.
5633 Tolman Hall
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

(415) 642-0740

D. Beginning and ending dates of the training program:

August 17, 1970 to June 30, 1971;

August 17-28, 1970 Pre-service Institute

September - June 30, 1971 In-service Internship

II. OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the CIP have been multiple, falling into three categories. The first category of objectives are those that pertain to the program as a whole. The second category of objectives relates more specifically to the intern participants in the program, and bear more closely on competencies, attitudes and knowledge objectives. The third category of objectives relates to the community colleges and staffs with which the CIP works in the preparation of the intern. Listed in outline form, the basic objectives of the CIP are as follows.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

A. To meet the educational needs of a broad spectrum of community college students, especially the educationally disadvantaged,

B. To alleviate the undersupply of well prepared community college instructors who understand and are committed to the goals and purposes of the community college,

C. To actively recruit and prepare teachers from minority groups,

D. To foster the development and dissemination of instructional and curricular innovation for the improvement of instruction,

E. To stimulate the further development of leadership potential of both interns and experienced faculty who participate in their preparation, PROGRAM OBJECTIVES, cont.

F. To test new approaches to instructor preparation and to improve instruction through pre-service and in-service activities,

OBJECTIVES FOR THE INTERNS AS INDIVIDUALS:

A. Acquiring a sensitivity to the special characteristics of the broad spectrum of community college students,

B. Developing an ability to plan instructional objectives, curricular materials and teaching strategies suitable for stimulating maximum learning by students,

C. Acquiring the attitudes and skills necessary for the recognition of special learning problems of diverse students and the evaluation of learning opportunities afforded them,

D. Gaining an understanding of the special attributes of the community college, its goals, purposes and problems,

E. Developing effectiveness in working cooperatively with colleagues,

OBJECTIVES FOR COOPERATING COLLEGES AND THEIR STAFF AND FACULTY

A. Develop an awareness and understanding of the needs and problems of new instructors, particularly instructors who are minority group members, OBJECTIVES FOR COOPERATING COLLEGES AND THEIR STAFF AND FACULTY, cont.

B. Develop skill in the analysis and evaluation of instruction, particularly in areas serving the educationally disadvantaged,

C. Enhance an understanding of the "new" student and the consequences for instruction and organizational change,

D. Analyze techniques and principles of curricular design and evaluation,

E. Develop an understanding of an operational competence in the role of experienced faculty colleague collaborator as it relates to the intern role.

These objectives represent, in most cases, an extension of the basic objectives set for the first year's operation of the CIP. Changes in objectives and program modification will be discussed as appropriate throughout this report.

The paramount objective of the recruitment, preparation and placement of instructors who are minority group members was met with a gratifying degree of success, as it was in 1969-70 (see appendix A for a list of the interns and their placement). Of the 21 interns placed, 17 were members of minority groups. Blacks, Chicanos and Asian-Americans were represented. Almost all of the interns have given outstanding service at their colleges, and a large proportion were in substantial contact with students who might be called "educationally disadvantaged." Many of the interns approached their teaching with an experimental outlook and undertook innovations in method, content and structure of instruction.

Several of the experienced faculty members assigned as colleague-collaborators to the interns themselves picked up on the interns innovative approaches for themselves.

This generalization is accurate: the CIP succeeded in attaining the greater proportion of its objectives. It must also be added that there were objectives which proved to be attainable only in part or not at all. One of the benefits of the CIP experience is certainly that of identifying which objectives are most readily attainable, given certain facts such as level of financial support, organizational bases, degrees of commitment, and other factors, such as the employment market, the contemporary scene as it affects the "mood" and politics withing the college and in the larger arena.

Proving most difficult to achieve were those objectives which related to internal change in the employing colleges, and the development of competencies in the faculty assigned to work with interns. There were successes enough among the sixteen colleges and twenty-one Experienced Faculty members (EFs) to lend credibility to the worthwhileness of their objectives and prospects of attainment, but the insight gained by the CIP is that a much more major effort than we could mount would be necessary for full attainment. To keep the proper perspective, it should be pointed out that what the CIP endeavored to do was to make some inroads into what is being increasingly recognized as the vast, complex and stubbornly unweildly problem of faculty development, a topic which is now attracting serious and sustained interest throughout the community college movement.

EDUCATIONAL NEED TO WHICH THE CIP WAS ADDRESSED

Ultimately the educational need to which the CIP is addressed is that of the student in the classroom. The efforts of the CIP all funnel toward the needs of the student. Of special interest is the "new" student, the student to whom the college experience is unfamiliar. Low income, minority, "push-out", undereducated adults, these are all new students.

The new student needs instructors with whom he can identify and communicate, and who he can trust to comprehend his cultural experience. Thus the CIP set out to recruit and prepare instructors who could match these needs. New students need to be taught in ways which call for departures from the conventional bill of fare; thus interns were encouraged to learn of innovative approaches and to adopt the frame of mind that makes a person an innovator.

EMPHASIS IN THE TRAINING

The heavier emphasis of the total training program, pre- and in-service was in the realm of attitudes, beliefs, philosophies, and values. However, the areas of knowledge and methods (or skills) were not much less emphasized. In fact, the viewpoint of the CIP team in planning for the second year was that all three deserved heavy attention. Inasmuch as they are so interwoven, they can scarcely be treated separately.

The advice of the first year's interns was helpful in determining relative emphases given to the major aspects of the program, though the advice at times appeared somewhat contradictory. Virtually all the interns urged less of the lecture and guest speaker approach, and suggested the elimination or reduction to a minimum of the conventional "schoolish" things. In particular, required reading lists, papers, and written assignments were singled out for de-emphasis as they cut too deeply into the limited time available. Recommended were those activities which gave opportunity for freewheeling yet probing discussion of "gut" issues, demonstrations of techniques, examples of curricular designs, and video taping with playback and critique.

Attitudes stressed were those of flexibility, experimental mindedness, curiosity about the college, openness in communication. Methods and skills stressed were in the realm of teaching techniques as well as in the realm of interpersonal communication.

In respect to what the CIP defined as points of emphasis and what points of the program the interns saw as important, it is interesting to look at responses to the question on the Participant Evaluation form which asks for a ranking of areas of program focus having primary value in professional development. The sumary of responses is reported below.

TABLE I about here

There is little that is conclusive in the reponses reported in Table I, though the pattern is suggestive. "Content," it appears, was valued least. What the term "content" itself was taken to mean is difficult to guess, but very likely it was used in the conventional sense, as a referent to academic materials from subject matter areas. As such,

TABLE I

INTERN'S RANKING OF AREAS OF PROGRAM FOCUS FOR VALUE IN PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

percentages
N=20

	1 most value	2	3	4 least value	No response/ not apply
CONTENT (updating in field of specialization or discipline)	15	10	10	30	35
ATTITUDE CHANGE (social sensitivity, philosophy, etc.)	30	20	25	10	20
METHODOLOGY (including skills development)	35	15	20	10	25
COMMUNICATION (understanding and communicating more effectively with others)	25	35	15	10	20

"content" was given little time in relation to the attention devoted to CIP's concept of content, which had to do with the intern as an individual and his competencies more than subject matter inputs. Thus, it is interesting to note that "attitude change," "methodology," and "communication" are valued, these areas being central in the CIP's definition of content.

Intern perception matched program intention. Academic content was recognized as a very important aspect of the intern's preparation but was attended to by graduate studies in the subject area or through private research. The contribution of the CIP in the area of content was mostly general, as in the provision of books, by means of the well used CIP library, and bibliographies. More specifically, the subject matter specialists in their visits worked with interns. For example, the history specialist helping in selection of class materials and the psychology specialist helping design an intern's course in Black Psychology.

Interestingly, there is no clear priority among "attitude change," "methodology", and "communication." Each has the approximate same number of interns chosing it of primary value. These results, it may be interpreted, confirm the premise of the planning team when it decided that the offering must be comprehensive, and flexible, and attempt to meet a variety of demands.

III. PROGRAM OPERATION

PARTICIPANTS

Expectations in terms of extent of interest and qualifications of the participants were met very satisfactorily. As anticipated, the 21 interns have turned out to be a dedicated and able group. By and large, the complex pattern of recruitment, screening and selection worked well in reducing the large numbers of applicants to a distinguished final roster. Table II shows the proportions of inquiry and applications to final placement, and depicts the large volume of initial applications from which the final distillate of the 21 placed interns was drawn.

TABLE II about here

SELECTION CRITERIA

The selection process for the CIP moved through two distinctive phases, each with its own criteria. The first phase was that of the CIP aimed at the recruitment, screening, and selection of candidates for the roster of recommended candidates. The second phase of the selection process took place at the colleges at which interns were considered for appointment. Selection criteria vary from college to college, and cannot be adequately summarized here, except to point out that the colleges typically put the intern applicant through the same processes and applied virtually the same criteria (an exception being in the instance of possession of graduate degrees), as they would apply to the regular applicant.

TABLE II

VOLUME AND DISPOSITION OF APPLICATIONS, 1970-1971

Disposition of Applications	Numbers
Placed as interns	21
Rostered as candidates	44
Interviewed, placed on waiting list, (not rostered)	20
Rejected	29
Considered, but withdrawn or no action	27
Inquiries	300

SELECTION CRITERIA, cont.

Whether certain criteria in the CIP phase were required, prefered or not utilized is indicated below.

A. Standardized test scores. Not utilized

B. Academic attainment. Required, but not directly by the CIP. The CIP did not specify any grade point average. However, any candidate had to meet requirements for admission to a graduate school for a master's program, if he did not hold one at the time of application. Thus, it can be said that all applicants had to meet the minimum requirment of academic attainment sufficient to provide entry into a graduate program.

C. Current position. Preferred, in that persons with experience in working with college age students, or in education related occupations, or in education itself tended to be better candidates. Of special interest to the CIP were experiences in tutorial programs, community action programs, recreation work, social service, and the like.

D. Age. Not utilized

E. Recommendations. Required. Three letters of recommendation were required. The letters served double duty for admission to the Graduate Division at Berkeley, and were included in the placement materials sent to colleges interested in interviewing an intern candidate.

SELECTION CRITERIA, cont.

F. Degrees. Required. A candidate had to hold a baccalaureate degree to qualify for admission to the program. Further, to be credentialed to teach in a California Community College, he had to either hold a master's degree, its equivalent, or be in a program leading to such a degree.

G. Interviews. Required. Each applicant had at least one informational interview. If the candidate made application and was considered an appropriate prospect, a second screening interview was scheduled. Interns from the previous year were utilized on the two man teams that conducted these hour long, depth interviews and much weight was placed on the results. In the CIP interviews, the interviewers sought evidence of traits of openess, communication, skill, sophistication concerning current issues, self-identity and concept, articulation, insight, and poise.

A second round of interviews confronted the applicant when he went to colleges interested in his application. These interviews would frequently include a faculty committee, students (especially in the ethnic studies areas), division or department chairman, dean and the president.

H. Geographic location. Preferred. Applications from persons out of convenient commuting distance from Berkeley were accepted, but applicants close enough in to be readily available for interviews at colleges considering their applications had the best luck.

SELECTION CRITERIA, cont.

I. Credentialability. Required. The applicant had to qualify for credentialing under the requirements of the State of California. A change in credential regulations in the summer of 1970 made the obtaining of intern credentials much easier than previously.

COMMENTARY ON SELECTION CRITERIA

By and large the criteria and the system administering them worked well. Of the group that was ultimately rostered, all were employable and offered unique qualifications to potential employers. Many combined special academic preparations (as in the area of ethnic studies) with community based experience.

A roster was developed that offered a wide variety of candidates, in respect to age, sex, race, ethnicity, field of study, background experience, interests, commitments, and personal characteristics. The roster eventually reached the size of 45. This figure is close to twice the number of budgeted intern slots, or 24. This strategy of over-rostering was dictated by market conditions, as it could not be predicted where jobs would occur, in what subject areas, and what the specific preferences of the colleges would be. The colleges themselves frequently did not know what positions might be open until very late, being caught as they were in budgetary problems. As the prospects for placement got more dim for the initial roster, the CIP added candidates, hoping to match some need that might fortuitously materialize, or needs that were signaled by colleges.

SELECTION CRITERIA, cont.

Not only did the CIP staff work strenuously -- and seemingly endlessly -- at locating openings, but the interns themselves worked hard. Some became more discouraged than others and withdrew from the race for positions after disappointments with the round of applications, interviews, the illusions of hope, and then the let down.

One definite recommendation emerges from this experience. Intern placement cannot be conducted efficiently and economically and humanely as a function of the market place. Another program such as the CIP should set high among its priorities the finding of a way to obtain firm commitments to employ interns from cooperating colleges.

As to the complex and sometimes cumbersome paper work involved in completing the application materials required of the various agencies that the CIP meshed with, the experiences of 1969 showed ways of streamlining procedures and minimizing forms. (See appendix B for the pamphlet of instructions for applications and admission sent to applicants.) The program secretary and office manager served a most useful capacity in assisting applicants in the completion of the many papers required.

While discussing the application and placement phase, it should be noted that the CIP staff found itself serving the very useful function of informational and career counseling for many individuals interested in community college teaching, but whose particular case did not indicate application to the CIP.

FACULTY-PARTICIPANT RATIO

It is difficult to describe a faculty-participant ratio for the CIP, because of the unique staffing patterns. Generally, staffing was planned to provide for as much one-to-one or small group interaction as possible. Essentially, there were three varieties of "faculty" working with the 21 interns throughout the year: one, was the CIP staff, (director and associate director), two the four subject area specialists, and three, the experienced faculty (EFs) from the colleges employing interns. During the two week pre-service institute, the CIP staff and the specialists constituted a teaching/counseling team of six full time members. The ratio of six to twenty-one reduces to a proportion of one to three, a characteristic demanded by the objectives of the program and the nature of the participants and their needs. During the academic year, the efforts of the CIP team were augmented by the on-campus EF, whose function it was to collaborate with the intern in planning and conducting his induction into teaching. Thus, the ratio of faculty to intern remained quite high throughout the year.

STAFF PATTERNS

The initial planning for the CIP envisioned a unique staffing pattern. It was designed to accomodate the special kinds of work that would have to be done with the interns, to maximize the range of backgrounds, experience and expertness to be available to the intern, and to provide a two way linkage by which the experienced faculty members would contribute to the development of the intern, and reciprocally, by which the CIP might contribute to the development of instruction and curriculum at the employing colleges. It was believed that the individual intern's introduction would be facilitated by a maximum of personal attention in an individualized program of personal development.

To accomplish these goals, four components were built into the CIP staffing arrangement, the CIP staff (Director and Associate Director, and Secretary) the four Subject Area Specialists, (see appendix C for staff roster), the Experienced Faculty member (EF) (see appendix D), and the guest speaker, consultant, lecturer. With this four fold staffing, the intern would be in daily contact with a colleague instructor during the year, as well as with the CIP staff and specialists when they made their visit and during in-service seminars and workshops, and during pre-service program, would have maximum opportunity for interaction with fellow interns and the CIP team of six.

THE CIP TEAM

The CIP staff and the four specialists constituted the CIP team. The "managerial functions", such as bookkeeping, record keeping, relations with the other organizations such as the University, the State Department of Education, and the USOE, were the responsibility of the CIP staff. The staff also initiated planning, maintained contact with cooperating colleges, organized sessions, prepared reports, and in general carried the burden of routine organizational duties.

The role of the specialist evolved during the two years of CIP operation. Originally conceived of as a consultant and instructor for the pre-service institute, the role expanded to include planning, intern evaluation, and counseling. In large part, the expansion of the role was the consequence of the high caliber of men who became the specialists. All were active and informed in their fields. The specialists contributed enormously to the CIP by instilling in the program the sense of reality, urgency ...and hope...that is the essential ingredient of any program that would aspire to prepare minority instructors for service in the colleges of today.

The CIP team first took shape in the spring of 1969, when it began to meet to plan the content of the pre-service institute. It was soon discovered that there was a wide range of personal styles, experiences, interests, viewpoints, as well as a rapidly growing sense of colleagueship and mutual respect. This characteristic developed into a positive asset commented upon very favorably by interns in both years, namely, that the team exemplified among themselves multiple and contrasting definitions of success in the role of instructor, that the ability of the team to differ, yet function cooperatively and constructively, embodied a model for emulation of tough tolerance.

One intern succinctly described the CIP team as he saw it, capturing the essence the intent underlying the team's organization, composition, and functioning:

> CIP provided me with cordial, amiable, and other pleasant types of companionship. Chet, Steve, Sandy, Don, Paul and John were all excellent --- each had a different approach and attitude about teaching, etc. They were able to instill in me a respect for different styles and goals of education. Each in his own right was a potential "model" --- something that you might fashion yourself after (at least in the early stages).

THE CIP TEAM, cont.

The principle duties of the specialists were planning for the pre-service institute and the in-service seminars, serving as instructors and discussion leaders at the institute and during the seminars, and making field visits to interns in their respective areas of specialization.

The specialists were busy men, fully engaged in active professional roles. Hence, it was difficult for them to engage as fully as they wished in the specialist role. The loss was felt by the interns as well, many of whom commented that they would like to have seen a great deal more of the specialists. It is not likely, though, that this problem can be readily solved. The very persons who would best serve as a specialist in the demanding role of counselor, planner, evaluator of instructional procedures, instructor, discussion leader, plus exemplifying in his own life the kind of instructor an intern might want to become is characteristically committed to a full time position and carries additional professional responsibilities. One specialist became the dean of instruction of a major urban community college, another was fully engaged in an innovative cluster college program as a founder and instructor, another directed an experimental program in addition to a heavy load of faculty leadership duties, while still another was fully engaged in a doctoral program, a professorship in ethnic studies at a private college, and an administrative internship at a large community college.

What is the solution for securing a major claim on scarce talent? Incentives in the form of monetary reward is only a partial answer, though it does assist the person rearrange the priority of his commitments. The answer may be in expanding the program in scale, such that the required talent can be taken on in a full time position.

THE EXPERIENCED FACULTY MEMBER

A pivotal role in the initial conceptualization of the CIP was that of the intern's colleague-collaborator. This role was first termed "master instructor", but the nomenclature soon was purged of inadvertent but disagreeable overtones to become "EF", or experienced faculty member. The EF role was an enlargement and enhancement of the more familiar and conventional role of the "supervising instructor," associated with the practice, or directed, teaching approach to instructor preparation. The role was built on the knowledge that among every college faculty there are instructors who are distinguished by their interests in instructional development, curriculum, possess attributes of open-mindedness, experimentalism, and are secure and skilled in working with others.

The function of the EF was to direct the intern's multifaceted program of induction throughout the in-service year. This program, ideally, would include visits by the EF to the intern's classes for observation and feedback, critiques as well as visits by the intern to the EF's classes, familiarization with the college, its routines (such as attendance reporting, ordering supplies, and the like), its decision making apparatus (the faculty senate, committees, the governing board), its operating components (the counseling program, student activities), and a study of the college's students and their characteristics.

The EF would also work with the intern on the design of curriculum, provide advice on techniques, and consult on the many matters, large and small, that are of concern to the beginning instructor, such as grading policies, techniques for student evaluation, alignment with professional groups, and the like.

THE EXPERIENCED FACULTY MEMBER, cont.

Several incentives were built into the role, one being the plan that the college would give the intern one of the EF's regularly assigned classes. Thus, the EF would have in effect one or more classes of released time. The CIP also paid an honorarium, both for the in-service part of the program and for the portion of the pre-service institute attended by the EF. A more general incentive was assumed, that there is an intrinsic reward and gratification in fulfilling the sense of professional obligation to work with the new instructor, to be a part of the solution to the problem of shortage of minority instructors, and to be plugged into current and progressive trends educational reform. Lastly, a weekend retreat for EFs was held, which afforded the opportunity to participate in very pleasant surroundings in the important task of developing new concepts and models for faculty development.

The experience of two years has proven that the role of the EF is indeed pivotal in the intern's program of induction. The proportion of EF-intern colleagueships that fulfilled expectations was sufficient to inspire confidence in the original conceptualization. Numerous examples could be given of situations where EFs accorded the intern vital support and confidence when it was needed, or shaped an intern's approach to the content of his teaching, or mediated between the intern and pressures arising from within the college. Likewise, examples can be given of EF's who themselves would say, "I learned more from my intern than he learned from me," or, "...I have renewed my interest in education as a subject."

THE EXPERIENCED FACULTY MEMBER, cont.

There can be no concealing the fact, though, that the fulfillment of the EF role is hampered by a host of problems, many of which are beyond the control of any such program as the CIP. Of great value to the profession of community college teaching is the experience and insights accumulated by the CIP in regard to the EF role. For that role remains the pivotal role in faculty participation in the induction and on-going development of faculty, and programs of faculty development will have to work through these problems.

CIP experience has shown that the role has no precedent in the profession. The closest approximation is the obsolete " master teacher" - "student teacher" role relationship, or the master-apprentice role. There is some carry over, not very helpful, at that, of the role relationship of the graduate advisor-professor and graduate student. Because the role has no immediate precedent, it is poorly understood. Fulfillment of the role is not helped by the fact that not uncommonly the EF role is assigned on a kind of patronage basis, not on the basis of qualifications. In other cases, it was made on the basis of happenstance; who is around, and will you do it?

It was found that there is an ever present possibility of clash between EF and intern in personality, life-style, ideology, or school of thought regarding their subject area. In cases of severe clash (or indifference), the EF-intern arrangement gradually disolves, and the intern eventually finds one or more faculty colleagues who function as an EF surrogate. That almost all the interns did link with an EF or EF surrogate points to the essential and strategically vital aspect of the process of socialization undergone by the new instructor.

THE EXPERIENCED FACULTY MEMBER, cont.

The sheer lack of time plagued EF/intern relationships. As in the case of the specialist, the best material for the EF is typically the one who is fully committed to a wide range of college duties. Sometimes the EF turned out to be department or division head, who had too many other duties to work extensively with the intern. Also, any EF who was also department chairman found himself in a role conflict, as he was supposed to concurrently function as a non-judgemental colleague-collaborator with the intern, and to fulfill organizational responsibilities of passing judgement on the intern's work.

In retrospect, the experiment with the EF role was most fruitful, in respect to the insights gained in the area of induction of new faculty through interaction with experienced faculty. Clearly, the role remains a key one to faculty development. Equally as clear, major efforts will have to be made to define the role and make it valued and productive.

LECTURERS, CONSULTANTS AND GUEST SPEAKERS

At certain points in the program, persons of outstanding competence, specialization or experience were called upon to meet with the interns. In most cases, the interns were appreciative of the inputs, but tended to minimize the value of the "visiting expert" for the solution of their own immediate concerns.

The guarded reception accorded "outsiders" is explained in part by the dynamics of the pre-service institute. The intense discussions and high level of interaction among the interns and CIP team tended to create a commonality that made it difficult for a non-member to be assimilated. Frequently, the visiting expert would be assigned a topic that would challenge the preconceptions of interns, and thus served them well. To the extent that the guest speaker could respond to free wheeling and probing discussion he was appreciated.

It may be that the uneven reception accorded guest speakers and lecturers provides a clue as to the dynamics of a program that moves into concentration on interaction and development of communication skills, and away from cognitive inputs. The forming up of the sense of "group" suggests that the number of outsiders be kept at a minimum, and that those so included should have a continuing relationship with the group.

On the other hand, several interns suggested that they would like to see more formalized, "meaty" presentations by acknowledged experts, with structured question and answer discussion sessions provided. This expression does serve as a reminder that there is a positive and useful place for cognitive inputs.

THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY

Throughout the life of the CIP, from its earliest inception when Dean Theodore Reller responded to the request by the presidents of the community colleges of Northern California that the University resume a role in the preparation of instructors by reinstituting an internship program in some form by appointing the joint University-community college planning team, to the present, the positive and helpful role of the University has been indispensable for the program's success.

The cooperation and accomodation of the University made it possible for the CIP to create a unique package of nine quarter units of graduate work to be earned by the intern while enrolled as a student in the Department of Education, Graduate Division. As might be expected, the innovative aspects of the CIP, the severe problems of time imposed by late funding, and the difficulties of finding places for interns all combined to create complicated problems of application, admission and enrollment. The Graduate Division, the Registrar, the Office of Campus Research, and the Department of Education, and others, all cooperated fully in finding solutions.

Adding quality and depth to planning and effectiveness in program management has been the continuing consultation of the experts in the University's Program in Community College Education (PCCE). Dale Tillery, initial member of the CIP planning team, and whose interest and expertness in faculty development reaches back to his early development and direction of the pioneering Graduate Internship Program for Junior Colleges in 1959, has been a constant source of counsel and guidance. As principle investigator for the CIP grant, he has been especially important in developing program concept and in maintaining relations with other components of the University and the community colleges. Charles C. Collins, also of the PCCE and prolific and innovative writer in the field of counseling and community college education, has been an unfailing source of wise counsel and stimulating ideas. Both men, as well as others of the PCCE, have served the program as participants and resource persons.

ACTIVITIES

In this section, the major segments of the program will be discussed. The major segments of the program were three in number; placement, pre-service and in-service. Indication will be given as to how the segments affected the attainment of program objectives.

Phase I: Placement

The placement phase of CIP actually began in its most preliminary form in December 1969 with the first inquiries of potential applicants, and continued until the opening of classes in September, 1970. At that very late date the last two interns were placed after a period of cliffhanging negotations, just in time to commence teaching. Between these times, a series of events were coordinated to achieve the objective of recruiting, screening, selecting, and placning outstanding candidates, especially minority group members.

The placement phase began in earnest with the notification that refunding for the program was forthcoming. Although the lateness of the year raised serious doubts about filling the 24 intern slots, the determination was to take the risk and proceed. An intensive effort began with the development of the roster of recommended candidates.

The first step was to launch a publicity campaign. (See appendix E). News of the program and its characteristics was spread to the public, colleges, university, and community colleges by means of news releases, posters, dissemination of borchures, direct and extensive contacts by mail and telephone, and a word of mouth campaign, in which the 1969 interns played a large and useful part. The back files of early inquirers were turned to and interesting persons invited to apply. The result was a large number of inquiries and applications in a very short time.

Every applicant was accorded an informational interview with the CIP staff. These interviews required a great deal of time, but it was well worth it, in terms of clarification of program aims and procedures to applicants, counseling and effectiveness in initial screening of applicants.

For those applicants who finally became interns the training program in effect began with these initial interviews, and continued through the CIP screening interviews and extended into their experience in making contacts and interviewing at the colleges.

A preliminary screening was made on the basis of application materials and the initial interview. Applicants meeting the basic criteria were invited to meet with a two man interviewing team for a depth interview. Interns from 1969-70 were used to very good advantage on these teams. On the basis of the materials accumulated, including interview reports, letters of recommendation, application materials, and evaluation of the applicant's prospectus for employability (e.g., were there any jobs in that field?, would the candidate relocate, if necessary?, how will he look to a faculty committee?), the CIP staff sorted the applications into these categories; rostered (accepted), non-rostered (accepted to a waiting list) and reject.

Candidate Introduction Day was scheduled for May 2, 1970. The purpose of this event was to acquaint the colleges with the program and the rostered candidates in an efficient way. Preliminary material was sent to each college describing the interns. At the all day session, college representatives met with the assembled interns, first as a group, then in individual interviews. Though the event was very late in the hiring season and despite the extreme shortage of positions, representatives from fifteen colleges attended. High praise was accorded the group of interns. Many college representatives voiced sincere expressions of regret that openings simply did not exist to accomodate interns.

Following Candidate Introduction Day, the scramble for positions began. Candidate morale began to sag as one fruitless interview followed another, or worse, there were not even any interviews at all to signify the appropriateness of the candidate's aspirations. Many of the candidates had gotten themselves "up" for his hazardous foray into a new venture, and had begun a radical renovation of self concept to suit their cherished purpose, to become a community college instructor. The absence of opportunity was bound to be a reminder of former disappointments. Some candidates withdrew from the roster. Others did not formally withdraw, but ceased to actively pursue the openings scouted out by the CIP and the University placement office.

Yet many candidates persisted, resourcefully and energetically, in the search for employment. Augmenting the rostered candidates eventually placed were those applicants referred to the program by colleges. These latter interns had been recruited by the colleges, which had special needs for their services but wished to see them participating in a training program.

When a college was ready to employ an intern, the CIP staff would begin final negotiations. Matters to be resolved included salary, teaching load, and assignment of an EF. In many cases, the basic plan and purposes of the program would have to be carefully explicated. As in the first year of the program, this phase consumed an enormous amount of time. The second time around conformity by the employing college to the basic plan in all its details was more successfully maintained. Also, in this phase, the credential problem re-arose to vex the program, although in a new form. Previously, the problem had been to find a way of utilizing an internship credentialing authorization originally legislated for elementary and secondary teachers. In 1970, the problem was to encourage action at the Office of the Chancellor of California Community Colleges, which had taken over the credentialing authority from the State Department of Education. The need was for the Board to create a credential suitable for interns who would be in a graduate program, but not yet hold the master's degree or the equivalent.

In reflecting on the frantic activities of the first phase, it can only be said that a program like the CIP simply must be certain of its funding by the January preceding the academic year of its operation. What few positions there were available were usually taken by the time the CIP had prepared its roster. Moreover, without certainty of funding any program is seriously remiss in encouraging prospective participants to commence the major reordering of their lives that participation would require, if there is no certainty of the program's existence. To avoid a justly deserved condemnation for "running a game", the CIP would not make commitments that would foster undue hope until funding was certain. This scrupulous approach no doubt handicapped the program in the race for places, but it did maintain the integrity of the program.

Phase II: Pre-Service

The main focus of the pre-service phase was the two week institute held in Berkeley August 17 through August 28.

Seeking to improve on the previous year's experience, a more comfortable setting for the institute was found in a University dormitory. A large, well furnished meeting room wasavailable, as were a number of smaller meeting rooms. Dining facilities were handy, and rooming was available for those needing it. Though the accomodations were conducive to group cohesion and minimized those disruptions such as having to disperse to find lunching facilities, many interns recommended that an even more self-contained and isolated facility be found. Serious consideration should be given to developing such programs as the pre-service institute in a live-in framework. This might, as one intern suggested, "...make it a total experience."

The content and procedures for the institute grew from the successful aspects of the 1969 institute. Certain improvements and new approaches were made by the CIP team, assisted by the inputs given by interns at a mid-summer planning session. A refinement was the identification and articulation of several basic "threads" to be woven through the institute. Reduced to a minimum number and chosen for their salience in the experience of the new instructor, the threads were; communication (with students, and each other, as well as communication skills development for students), student characteristics (and intern reaction to characteristics), evaluation of students (and self-evaluation), and self-awareness (as facilitated by video taping with playback). Also included were myths and realities of the community college, curriculum development and instructional techniques.

Program of Activities: The most efficient way of depicting the program by day and topic is in a chart form.

CHART (about here): Calendar for Pre-Service

Time and space do not permit an extensive description and analysis of the activities of the pre-service institute. However, several highlights can be singled out to give the flavor of the procedures and content. Video-Taping and Playback; Encouraged by the effectiveness at the 1969 pre-service institute of the video tape as a source of feedback and a basis for discussion and critique of teaching/learning, plans were made for extensive use in the 1970 institute.

Video taping proved to be as valuable as expected. The procedure was essentially peer teaching following a sequence of increasingly complex teaching tasks. The first video taping was a 2-4 minute presentation in which the intern gave a short simple account of what he taught, and why. The next, more demanding session required the intern to plan an explication of a concept from his field, and to make provision for obtaining feedback from his peer "class." A culminating session was an extended lesson of 7-10 minutes. The video teaching was done in small groups of 7-9, including the CIP team. Importantly, the teaching was defined as peer teaching. That is, the teaching was done to the fellow interns as peers, who were not asked to play roles of students or whatever.

TOPICAL CALENDAR: COOPERATIVE INTERNSHIP PROGRAM PRE-SERVICE INSTITUTE

MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY	SATURDAY
Business, overview The Community College: Myths and Realities Role of the Instructor in the College	Student Characteristics Video Taping; peer teaching	The Anatomy of a Community College Course Course Design: Objectives, Strategies, Evaluation, "Standards", Relevance Teaching techniques	Evaluation: Tests, Feedback, Non-intellective Teaching techniques	Video-taping; peer teaching Reflections of the weeks work Group process	Group process
Development of a Course Outline Interaction Analysis Planning Session	Roles of the Instructor The Profession of Teaching Planning/ Business Session	Video-taping; Peer Teaching Cycle	Experienced Faculty Meeting Curriculum Development	Presentation and Critique of Course Outline Reflections of the Institute	

Program of Activities, cont: Video taping and playback served well in the attainment of primary program objectives and provided an important way of weaving the program threads together. In particular, the taping instilled selfconfidence, warmed interns up to the idea of being observed, and opened a way for acceptance of criticism. Certain fundamental skills in communication were practiced, such as non-verbal communication, attention to double messages, and other. Video taping is not an experience that interns---even less experienced instructors---rush to embrace, initially, at least. As one intern put it, "I saw myself like I have never seen myself and I didn't like it... ." But that self perception was the beginning of a long and arduous process of defining herself into the role of the instructor, a process which was accomplished successfully.

Curriculum; The large topic of curriculum development was dealt with selectively. Time was too short for any comprehensive approach, and the demands for attention to other areas were more pressing. The concepts of behavioral objectives (Mager), Bloom taxonomy, and the concept of "process as product" were stressed. Building upon the conceptualization of the affective, cognitive, and skill domains, CIP teams demonstrated how this approach to teaching can be translated into teacher/student behavior. Also, a major use of the time given to curriculum was spent in examining the "anatomy" of a community college course. As one of the few assignments made, interns were asked to integrate the curriculum and other topics in a short unit. (See appendix F).

Methodology; Video taping brought home the issues and problems of teaching methodology. Techniques of questioning were discussed, stressing as an example, the distinctions between convergent and divergent questioning. Role playing, socio-drama, panel discussion, and other approaches to including students in the teaching act were discussed and demonstrated. To dramatize the issues of evaluation of students, the interns were given an examination which combined desirable and undesirable aspects of testing. The resulting discussion, heated and probing,made the point.

Audio-visual materials and procedures were demonstrated by an intern from the previous year, who had developed a particularly successful use of the overhead projector and transparencies.

To prepare a groundwork for future visits to intern's classrooms and to sharpen intern's powers of observing, reporting and analyzing instructor behavior, the concept, premises and procedures of interaction analysis were introduced. Though the session was of interest to the interns, the general feeling was that a great deal more time would be needed to achieve a significant control of such a complex subject.

Group Interaction; The spring, 1970 retreat weekend devoted to group dynamics and interpersonal relations was so well received by the 1969 interns that the 1970 institute was designed to afford the interns an initial experience in group work. The weekend midway through the institute was set aside for this activity, commencing on Friday evening and continued until Saturday noon. The interns were divided into three groups, with the three CIP team members who were trained facilitators

Group Interaction, cont; serving as group leaders. The effect of the weekend's work was to move the level of group discussion onto a new plane of openess, with many interns feeling the stirrings of a new interest in developing self awareness, communication skills, and an interest in the uses of group dynamics as a teaching tool.

The major event in group dynamics was the Spring, 1971 weekend. A description and analysis of this event are given separately, below.

EF Participation; A group of twelve EFs joined the institute during the second week. Whereas the 1969 EFs had attended the institute for five days, the 1970 EFs attended for the last two days of the second week. Less "work" was scheduled for the 1970 EF's, as the experience of the previous year indicated. They spent the bulk of their time with the CIP team discussing the needs of interns, considering ways of planning a program of individualized intern induction, and anticipating aspects of their own roles. These EFs also participated actively in several group discussions with interns, and served as resource persons in the small group sessions in which the intern's curriculum development efforts were critiqued. Of course, the EF participation in the institute initiated the long process of establishing a colleague-collaborator relationship with the intern.

Commentary on the pre-service phase: Clearly, the pre-service institue is the program's best chance to get across fundamental concepts and to begin instilling or reinforcing desirable attitudes. Several premises guided the design of the pre-service institute. One was that the topics introduced would be the basis for discussion with interns during the field visit phase and in the Saturday seminars. Thus, no serious attempt at comprehensiveness was made in coverage of such topics as curriculum, evaluation, student traits, nor in subject matter fields.

It was planned that all presentations would serve a dual purpose, one being the content and substantive matter, the other demonstration of some teaching procedure, such as lecture (good and bad), discussion, role playing, and the like. Still another premise was that the program should be flexible enough to respond to participant needs, as they were generated and identified. A basic framework was prepared in advance, informed by the experience and judgement of the CIP team and the intern inputs, but care was taken to incorporate a procedure for intern participation in short and long range planning, such that the basic plan could be modified.

Duration and beginning and ending dates: The pre-service institute was two weeks in duration, occuring at the latest possible time in the summer before classes commenced at most colleges. Holding the institute at any other time would not be feasible. The experience of the 1969-70 institute was that two weeks was too brief. A three week institute, beginning earlier in August would allow time for more attention to curriculum development (which when done seriously necessitates time consuming research), peer teaching, and more meetings in subject matter groups for close analysis of materials. Any time longer than three weeks would probably not be useful.

Phase III: In-Service

The in-service phase took place primarily on the campus where the intern was employed. Consistent with a basic premise of the CIP, that new faculty development requires a very substantial directed field experience in the classroom, in contact with students, in relations with other faculty members was the essential ingredient of the in-service program.

To provide direction of the intern during the in-service phase, the CIP scheduled a series of one day seminars, a weekend retreat-seminar, and field visits by the CIP team. The EF was to be on hand for day to day needs, as well as for assistance in concerns particular to a given college, course, local problem or issue. Interestingly, some interns supplemented their sources of contact and consultation by seeking out fellow interns for get-togethers.

Saturday seminars were well attended. The interns reacted favorably to having the meetings at various person's homes, rather than in institutional settings. Free flowing discussion highlighted most of the meetings, as the interns expressed the desire to use the sessions for exploration of problems and issues. An exception was the last meeting, at which an authority on psychological measurement, Dr. Paul Heist, discussed with the interns the results of the Omnibus Personality Inventory, which interns had taken during the pre-service institute.

The dilemma facing the planners for the Saturday sessions, was the tension between those who prefered to get down to "nuts and bolts" topics, and those who wanted to ventilate strong feelings and probe fundamental social issues. A clear cut resolution to this problem is not forthcoming. An answer might be found by holding many more meetings, some mandatory for the group as a whole, but others on an optional basis and devoted to special topics and purposes, such as group dynamics and sensitivity training.

During 1970-71, more Saturday meetings were held than in 1969-70 Experience suggests that even more would be desirable. Interns suggested that the concentration of meetings be in the fall, and that there be at least two live-in weekend sessions, one given over to group dynamics, and the other to a workshop type session on particulars of curriculum and instruction.

Parjaro Dunes workshop/seminar on faculty development: In late December, 1970, the CIP conducted a workshop/seminar on faculty development at Pajaro Dunes, an isolated but splendid retreat facility on Monterey Bay. The workshop was addressed to the need for the development of the EF role, and of finding ways for inducting new faculty and renewing experienced faculty. The workshop was not in the original proposal, but was encouraged by Jack Orcutt as an appropriate use for certain unused funds in the grant.

The overall goal of the workshop was to prepare a model or models, for faculty development. It was specified that this model should attend to the needs of new and experienced faculty, minority faculty, and have short and long range components. A subsidiary goal was that of exploring ways and means of asking collaborative planning among a cross section of community college personnel.

Pajaro Dunes workshop/seminar on faculty development, cont:

Participating in the workshop were thirty individuals. The largest proportion was EFs from 1969-71. Also participating were the CIP team, several administrators from developing institutions, and several resource persons invited for their special interest and expertness in faculty development. The widely varying background experience, viewpoint, organizational positions, was advantageous, since any proposals would benefit from critiques from many perspectives. To facilitate the development of a minimal common ground, a sequence of pre-workshop mailings went out including readings, and a discussion of the purposes and anticipated outcomes of the workshop. (See appendix H).

The workshop began Friday evening with a meeting of the whole for purposes of goal clarification and organization. Sunday midday ended the workshop following another meeting of the whole for feedback and reporting from the three teams that had spent the intervening time finding their own ways to the objective of producing a model, or model(s) for faculty development. The three teams met in separate houses, and were required to produce premises, theories, descriptions and the like, which would be included in a model. (See appendix H).

The workshop produced some seminal ideas concerning faculty development, and an analysis of the complex of constraints and imperatives into which any such program might have to be launched. The workshop also provided for the EFs an important opportunity to identify with the CIP and the broader concern for faculty development. Many experienced instructors found the occasion to communicate across discipline, age, sex, and ideological lines, with the result of mutual enrichment. Finally, the workshop, in its product and in its process provided insights on planning processes for future events in collaborative planning.

Pajaro Dunes workshop/seminar on faculty development, cont:

An evaluation of the workshop would have to begin with a statement that the primary goal was not achieved. That is, the concrete, spelled out, models, evolved to the point of being working blueprints, did not materialize. In reality, this goal was excessively ambitious. Its realization was not possible.

The heterogeneity of the participants was a resource, as expected, providing a variety of viewpoints and experience to enrich the dialogue. The same heterogeneity evidenced in an uneven distribution of the ability for working in a small group setting to create and to synthesize. As the participant evaluations reveal, a few would have wanted much more structure and directive leadership. Others, to the contrary, were enthusiastic over the opportunity to freewheel and thrived in the setting. Likely, a more successful experience in collaborative planning would have to include pre-selection of participants. Steps would need to be taken to develop a common ground. More homogenization, in other words, would be required, in respect to frame of reference, agreement on goals, tolerance for ambiguity, expectations and personal commitment to share in the hard work of moving from discussion to writing and refinement. A strategy that might work would be that of asking participants to "buy-in" to the process by prior reading and the preparation of a position paper for pre-session distribution to other participants.

The workshop was throughly enjoyed by the participants, by their own report. Many came away inspired and renewed. That the model did not materialize should not detract from the fact that a large number of experienced faculty had a unique and productive professional experience that could not help but ensure the perpetuation of CIP goals.

Interpersonal Learning Weekend: A major addition to the CIP in 1970 was the inclusion of exercises and activities designed to facilitate the development of skills in communication and interpersonal relations. This program improvement was encouraged by the success of the spring, 1970 group process weekend for the 1969-70 interns.

In addition to the group work during the pre-service institute, a full weekend of group interaction was conducted in late March. This event was hailed by some of the interns as the most important event of the program, as it was perceived as a timely catalyst in personal growth. Others were less enthusiastic, but did enjoy the retreat aspects of the session. Since the event was voluntary, several did not attend at all. Because the event was of major importance in the program an evaluation project was undertaken by the associate director, and is presented below.

Field Visits: A key element in the overall program was the field visit to the intern by members of the CIP team. Each intern was visited between 5 and 8 times, by the Director, the Associate Director, and the specialist from the most appropriate subject area. In actuality, the total number visits to the intern's classroom would range higher, as EF's might visit between one and five times, in addition to department chairman and dean of instruction visits.

The focus of the visits by the CIP team was on the classroom interaction. The visitor took note of the content, delivery, organization of the material, the degree of student involvement, and estimated the degree to which the intern achieved the objectives he had set out for himself. In the conference which followed the visit, the intern got the benefit of the visitor's feedback. Also in the conference, larger issues of curricular organization, student response, assimilation into the role of instructor, and other salient topics were discussed.

The program of classroom visits rested in large part on the premise that the intern would benefit from the feedback of a skilled observer, with whom a prior rapport had been established (in the pre-service activities), and who was essentially a "neutral third party." It was initially hypothesized, then demonstrated, that the special value of the CIP visits and feedback sessions derived from the basically non-judgemental character of the observations and dialogue. Non-judgemental does not mean that criticism, positive and negative were not made, for indeed they were. In fact, most interns expressed a strong desire for evaluation. The non-judgemental aspect is seen in the contrast between the CIP visits and those of college deans, department chairmen, and in some cases, EFs, who were under the obligation to render evaluative judgements that were to become basic data in making decisions on the intern's job retention.

Commentary on the In-Service Phase: By and large, the in-service plan worked. A basic premise of the CIP is that the intern's development should take place in a context of reality, following a "warming up" experience at the pre-service institute. With the responsibility of teaching 3-5 classes, plus the manifold faculty duties the intern has the opportunity to put into practice and test theoretical considerations. To assist and support the intern in his "reality" experience, the CIP plan made provision for reunions of the inter group through the Saturday and weekend seminars, personal contact through field visits, and the presence of the EF.

In reflecting on the in-service phase, provocative questions arise. How does the intern get assimilated into the faculty, what accomodations does he make, in what ways does he change does the program default in

Commentary on the In-Service Phase, cont: in some way on what some interns might feel was an impled obligation of the CIP's "sheltering" role, what is the psychic cost to the intern of taking on the multifaceted role of instructor?

One conclusion bears true for 1970, as for 1969; interns find themselves dividing their time and commitment among too many obligations; program participant, graduate student, instructor, faculty member, student adviser and informal counselor...and presumably, a private life.

Duration of the Program and Beginning and Ending Dates:

The program is too short for interns who begin graduate programs concurrently with teaching duties. A program which would facilitate through stipends and other financial support part time teaching for two years while carrying a graduate load would be more appropriate. A year is probably long enough for the intern to accumulate the basic experience of being an instructor, and to ask the basic questions, but it is too short to find the answers.

If the assumption can be made that the changing nature of contemporary colleges requires continuing adaptation of the faculty member, then a year's program is only a beginning. Needed are programs that are available to instructors throughout his career, being geared to the special and pressing needs at the early, mid, and late career stages.

IV. EVALUATION

As the various components of the CIP have been discussed, evaluative comments have been offered. Taken in sum, these comments say affirmatively, yes, the CIP has met its objectives. The affirmative is not categorical, nor uniform, of course. Of the many goals enumerated at the outset of the report, not all have been attained to the degree desired. But, the primary goals as related to the objectives of the program have been well met indeed.

OBJECTIVES RELATING TO PLACEMENT

Outstanding as a major success of the program has been the recruitment, selection, preparation and placement of instructors committed to teach the broad spectrum of community college students, especially the "new" student. Of these instructors, 18 of 21 were members of minority groups. These instructors, like the non-minority instructors in the program, found themselves in college assignments that put them in substantial contact with "new" students.

Also, it should not be overlooked that the interns served well the "regular" students and the "normal" operation of their colleges, as the need for innovative instruction has by no means abated. Selected on the basis of criteria stressing ability and desire to teach well, to experiment, to develop in human relations, to reach students, the interns began the program with good potential. During the pre-service institute they were pressed to find ways...curricular design, teaching methodologies, student contacts...of translating idealism into action. Some of the interns have been truly outstanding in this regard, and most have been superior. Only a few would be regarded as "average", when the basis of comparison is other new instructors.

OBJECTIVES RELATING TO THE COLLEGES AND EXPERIENCED FACULTY MEMBERS

While the achievement of the primary goal, the placement of distinctive persons in intern spots, can be clearly demonstrated, objectives relating to the EFs and the employing colleges, those goals relating to changes in the internal structure and procedures of the individual colleges have been most difficult to attain. Objectives of developing instructional and evaluative skills in the EF, and promoting in-service programs around the intern proved to require a magnitude of change more complex and costly than the CIP could promote, given the organization of the program, its priorities, and level of funding. Yet, conversations with the EFs, reports from interns, the EF weekend workshop/seminar, reports from deans and department chairmen, all yield fragmentary evidence that in some cases the CIP did have an impact on the intern's EF and college. It is clear, though, that an effort to remodel the patterns of induction and preparation of new instructors and the continuing development of experienced instructors and evolution of an intern EF role relationships will require a program specially designed for the purpose, well funded and well founded on a solid commitment from participating colleges and personnel.

OBJECTIVES RELATING TO INTERNS

An evaluation of the CIP will have to deal with the question, how well did the interns perform as instructors? This question leads into the thickets and quagmires of the instructor evaluation issue, an issue which is claiming increasing attention but has not produced much in the way of ways of how go go about evaluation.

Evaluation Discussion: Some of the problems of instructor evaluation might be discussed usefully here, by way of prelude to reporting on the CIP project for the evaluation of interns. Accounting for the particular effects of the training program poses difficulties. There is the problem of initial input; interns were selected for their high potential, hence success could be hopefully foreordained. Could the training components have been instrumental mainly as tuning up processes? What was, then, the degree, of the effect of the training program? The answer to this question has been elusive, though the interns themselves report that the training components did serve positively in preparing them for their initial teaching and that the CIP did offer a valued, continuing source of support.

Another problem is that of the circumstantial effects of the individuals particular teaching environment. There can be no doubt that the performance of the intern was shaped by the situation into which he entered. An intern rated as doing well in an especially difficult assignment might have earned much higher accolades in another assignment more compatible with his traits and more conducive to his growth.

A key problem in evaluating the instructor is, who do you ask? There is one point of view, not entirely without merit, that the ultimate evaluation of the instructor is described in the measurement of student performance (which becomes measurable upon the restructuring of the learning experience around behavioral objectives). For interns, this approach would be only a partial measure, as the role of the intern was to be more than manager of learning. The intern was to be a model, Evaluation Discussion, cont: a counselor, a change agent, a curricular innovator, and an experimenter in instructional technology. These multiple facets interface with a number of aspects of the college, the student, the faculty, the EF, the administration, the community. Who then to ask? Who, can be asked, given logistical and methodological considerations?

The CIP evaluation project developed two thrusts. One was to ask for evaluation from various persons who would have a-perception of the intern. These were the Dean, the EF, the intern's students. The other was to focus on one aspect of the training program, the Pajaro Dunes group interaction weekend for assessment by interns of the effect of the experience on their teaching. The pre-service institute was not evaluated as a special project, as it had been already done last year, and it was not felt that the evaluation of the 1970 group would vary a great deal. (See appendix J for Fiedler's interesting analysis of the institute).

The project of evaluating the intern by gathering responses from a variety of sources proved to be difficult, but productive of interesting results. Methodological problems turned up to compromise the validity and reliability of the results, but not so much that some useful and defensible generalizations could not be cautiously drawn. Obtaining student evaluations of interns by means of questionnaires was especially troublesome. Interns found it difficult to administer the questionnaire to their students, particularly if they delayed until late in the semester. In a few cases, interns declined to administer the questionnaire altogether. It may be conjectured that in some cases students who identified very strongly with their instructor saw the questionnaire as an instrument of an oppressive system and answered it (however cynically) in whatever way would best serve the intern.

Evaluation Discussion, cont: Companion to the question, Who to ask? is the question, what to ask? Generally, questions were designed to get responses that reflected on the intern's performance along dimensions that related to program objectives. The major categories of inquiry were: relations with students, faculty and community; attitudes toward experiment, innovation; instruction and teaching performance. Evaluators were asked to compare the instructor, not to rate him on any absolute scale. The basis of comparison, in the case of the Deans, was other instructors who had taught at the institution the same length of time as the intern. Students were asked to compare the intern to "instructors in general," on the assumption that students do possess a collective awareness of instructors as a group, much as they could describe a collective awareness of doctors, lawyers, or dentists. EFs were asked to compare the intern to other first year instructors.

In the case of the Deans, students, and the EF, the comparisons were made on scales that made more definite the categories for comparison. (See appendix J for the forms used).

Despite methodological problems, and the cautions necessary when combining data from different sources, this conclusion is clear: the interns as a group were rated as being better than other first year, or new, instructors in many ways, and of the interns, many were rated as much better. The following discussion will describe the ways in which the interns were rated and report the results.

EF evaluation of interns: During the year, the CIP staff kept in touch with EFs concerning the intern's progress, usually through conversations during visits to the intern's campus. Initially, it had been hoped that the pre-service institute might provide the opportunity to develop some procedures and policy for observation and

EF evaluation of interns, cont. evaluation of instruction to be used uniformly by the CIP observer and the EFs, such as the interaction analysis scheme, but it did not work out.

Experience strongly suggests that an EF will evaluate an intern on a set of criteria which may be shared only in part by the CIP team. Perhaps the CIP's observations were colored by the personal relationship that evolved with many interns. Also, CIP evaluations were no doubt put in a special perspective by the non-involvement of the CIP team members in the in-house contentions involving interns and EFS. CIP observations were confined almost entirely to the intern as a classroom instructor, while the EF perhaps saw the intern in more dimensions as a colleague, a fellow committee member, an ally, a competitor.

Though EFs will vary among themselves on the criteria they use and in their evaluative techniques, it seemed defensible to assume that their evaluations would be within a frame of reference uniform enough to permit a summary of their responses and some guarded generalizations. To obtain data from the EFs a partially structured questionnaire with one comparison scale was prepared.

Responses on the comparison scale of the questionnaire follow a positive trend, as the EFs compare the interns with other first year instructors. The intern was typically described as "definitely outstanding" and "better" in their overall performance. Table III reports the distribution of EF responses.

TABLE III about here

TABLE III

EXPERIENCED FACULTY (EF) EVALUATION OF INTERNS ON ALL AROUND PERFORMANCE USING OTHER FIRST YEAR INSTRUCTORS AS THE REFERENCE GROUP FOR COMPARISON

	N=16	
	No.	%
Definitely outstanding	7	44
Better	5	31
About the same	3	19
Below	1	6
Definitely poorer	-	-

EF evaluation of interns, cont: The EFs were asked to comment on six generalized aspects of the intern's work. These were; relations with students, relations with faculty, relations with the community, subject matter control, instructional technique, and attitude toward innovation and improvement. Interestingly, some general trends developed among the responses, when they were classified by a sorting procedure into categories reflected a "positive" or a "negative" evaluation.

Standing out most clearly and with the greatest degree of unanimity was the positive response describing the relations of interns to students. "Displays excellent rapport," was a remark that recurred, or as one EF said, "The students are really 'with'_________". Control of subject matter was remarked upon positively, though with a few exceptions about half or the remarks on instructional techniques were positive, and about half were lukewarm. Attitudes toward innovation and improvement were also mixed, but definitely leaning toward the positive. Relative to the general trend of positive remarks, relations with the faculty had the larger proportion of negative remarks, though usually qualified by some remark such as, "of course he is too busy to get around... ." Interestingly, most of the EFs disclaimed the ability to comment on the intern's relation with the community.

In an open-ended question, EFs were asked to comment on the intern in a general sense, touching on areas of growth and improvement, areas needing improvement and areas of strength. Taken as a whole, the comments are thoughtfully balanced between an enumeration of strengths and indication of areas that will require further attention. The tone is positive and commendatory toward interns. A subjective reading between the lines suggests that interns are viewed as are regular instructors when they are evaluated...that there are probably concerns left unvoiced and criticisms unmentioned.

In the main, the EF evaluation is positive. It can be concluded that the interns are regarded favorably and appear in the eyes of the EFs to be strong where the objectives and goals of the program would anticipate them to show strength.

Deans of Instruction Evaluation of Interns: Deans of Instruction were asked to evaluate the interns at their college using a scale requiring the Dean to compare the intern with other instructors who had been teaching at the college for the same length of time. The comparisons were on ten dimensions which touched on subject matter, relations with faculty, community and students, and attitudes toward innovation, experimentation and awareness of the community college.

Nine deans responded, providing evaluations for 14 interns. The patterns of response are adequate for speculation, though some cautions are necessary, inasmuch as only 66% of the interns were evaluated. Table IV reports the responses of the deans.

TABLE IV about here

At any rate the composite pattern of responses is positive and affirmative of interns in comparison to instructors who had been teaching at the college an equal time. This pattern reflects even more positively on the intern when it is considered that they typical new instructor in California is one who has already gained 3-5 years of teaching experience.

TABLE IV

DEAN OF INSTRUCTION EVALUATION OF THE INTERN USING OTHER INSTRUCTORS WHO HAVE TAUGHT AT THE COLLEGE THE SAME LENGTH OF TIME AS THE REFERENCE GROUP FOR COMPARISON

PERCENTAGES N=14

	much less	less	about the same	more	much more	no response
Command of the subject matter	-	28	42	21	-	7
Interest in innovation and experiment	-	-	42	35	14	7
Participation in the affairs of the college	7	-	35	28	28	-
Acceptance by faculty and administration	-	14	35	28	21	-
Participation in community activities	-	7	42	21	14	14
Potential for growth as an instructor	-	7	7	63	21	-
Awareness of the community college as a unique institution	-	-	28	63	7	-
Understanding of students	-	-	35	56	-	7
Ability to work with students	-	-	35	56	7	-
Acceptance by students	-	-	35	49	14	-

Deans of Instruction Evaluation of Interns: cont. In command of the subject matter, interns are about on par with other instructors (though one dean, perhaps as a matter of policy noted that all four interns at his college were "below" other instructors; the EFs for the same four thought of the interns as "above"). The interns have an edge on other instructors in their interest in experimentation and innovation. The wide spread of responses in respect to participation in community affairs and college activities, and acceptance by faculty and administration attests to the individual differences among the interns, but still describes them as more involved than the comparison group. The greatest unanimity of response in the dean's comparison of the interns in potential for growth as instructors. An awareness of the community college exceeding that of other instructors is attributed to the interns by the deans. In the area of relations with students, the interns contrast favorably with other instructors. Deans rate them as more understanding of students, having more ability to work with students, and enjoying more acceptance by students.

It may be concluded that the responding Deans have a good, but tempered opinion of interns in contrast with other instructors new to the college. Several are considered to be "much more" in almost every category, while only a scattering of responses go below "about the same."

Student's Evaluation of the Interns: In tapping student's perceptions of the interns, several purposes were to be served. The main purpose was to obtain a balanced evaluation, as students could scarcely be overlooked. Another purpose was to ascertain if there would be any important pattern of agreement and disagreement among the evaluations by Deans, EFs, and students.

The project was the most complex of the components in the evaluation program. Questionnaires were especially designed, and supplied to the interns in numbers sufficient for their enrollments. The questionnaire bore its own instructions, the intent being to make it as self-explanatory as possible in recognition of the varying circumstances in which it would likely be administered. The questionnaire was distributed in the last month of classes. Some difficulties arose, from the lateness of the year. By then, the attrition of students dropping out had reduced class size in all cases. Those students finishing, then, tended to share common traits of persistence and some degree of success in the course. Further, several interns neglected to administer the questionnaire until it was too late. Hence, the responses for any given class cannot be taken as a representative sample, nor a total population sample.

Of the intern group, thirteen administered the questionnaire. Eight did not. Two were counselors for whom the project did not apply. Ten colleges were involved, touching a total of 34 classes, from which 700 questionnaires were completed.

The results of the questionnaire, presented in the following tables, are shown as means and standard deviations. For each intern, a table has been prepared, showing student responses results by classes and for interns. For the intern group as a whole, the mean of means has been computed and presented in Table 18.

TABLES 5 through 18 about here

Commentary: Before commenting on the results of the student questionnaire, it is necessary to stress again that the data is suggestive, but not adequate as a basis for conclusive findings.

Several patterns emerge in the responses when the interns are taken as a group. Clearly apparent is a pattern of comparison in which the interns stand out as a group distinctive from the other instructors against whom they are being compared. Several individual interns are considered by their students to be well above the other instructor in all categoires, and a few are seen as about the same. None are considered lesser than others. The group, is seen as "more" able than the other instructors in a variety of ways. By and large there is consistency in the ratings, which is interesting in view of the considerable differences in the intern's teaching assignments, the locale and character of their colleges, and their own individual differences in terms of age, sex, race and ethnicity.

Another pattern results, apparently from the ability of the interns to elicit favorable comparison in respect to their relations with students. For the interns, the highest ratings cluster around these items; "...is approachable by students", "...respects students," "...understands the problems of students." Also attracting favorable comparison is the trait, "...is flexible and open minded," a characteristic which would presumably be associated with good rapport with students. Interestingly, EFs commented favorably upon the intern's rapport with students, as did the Deans, though less affirmatively.

Name of Intern (02)

College

TABLE 5

This instructor compared to instructors in general......									Total	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
..is able to make subject interesting	4.38	.74	4.36	.64					4.38	.70
..tries a variety of teaching techniques	4.08	.73	4.00	.85					4.04	.79
..respects students	4.46	.93	4.46	.66					4.46	.82
..is approachable by students	4.69	.46	4.64	.64					4.67	.55
..understands problems of students	4.62	.63	4.18	.72					4.42	.70
..is well informed on community problems & issues	4.62	.63	4.27	1.14					4.46	.91
..grades fairly on a reasonable standard	4.62	.49	4.00	.74					4.33	.69
..is flexible and open-minded	4.69	.46	4.73	.45					4.71	.46
..is clear and definite about course objectives	4.54	.50	4.36	.77					4.46	.64
..knows the subject matter	4.69	.46	4.36	.77					4.54	.64

Name of Intern (03)

College

TABLE 6

This instructor compared to instructors in general......									Total	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
..is able to make subject interesting	3.75	.97							3.75	.97
..tries a variety of teaching techniques	3.81	.73							3.81	.73
..respects students	4.13	.78							4.13	.78
..is approachable by students	4.50	.71							4.50	.71
..understands problems of students	4.25	.56							4.25	.56
..is well informed on community problems & issues	4.06	.97							4.06	.97
..grades fairly on a reasonable standard	4.13	1.05							4.13	1.05
..is flexible and open-minded	4.31	.58							4.31	.58
..is clear and definite about course objectives	3.19	.88							3.19	.88
..knows the subject matter	4.25	.56							4.25	.56

Name of Intern (04)

College

TABLE 7

This instructor compared to instructors in general......									Total	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
..is able to make subject interesting	4.21	.71	3.61	.64	3.75	.43			3.93	.73
..tries a variety of teaching techniques	3.83	.65	3.87	.54	4.25	.43			3.88	.60
..respects students	4.17	.79	4.09	.88	4.50	.87			4.16	.84
..is approachable by students	4.69	.46	4.17	.76	5.00	0.			4.50	.66
..understands problems of students	4.48	.62	4.35	.70	4.75	.43			4.45	.65
..is well informed on community problems & issues	3.97	.67	3.87	.74	4.50	.50			3.96	.71
..grades fairly on a reasonable standard	3.66	.96	3.48	.58	3.00	0.			3.54	.80
..is flexible and open-minded	4.35	.66	4.09	.78	4.00	.71			4.21	.73
..is clear and definite about course objectives	3.38	.89	3.78	.72	4.50	.87			3.63	.88
..knows the subject matter	3.79	.85	3.83	.76	4.00	1.00			3.82	.83

Name of Intern (05)

College

TABLE 8

This instructor compared to instructors in general......									Total	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
..is able to make subject interesting	3.77	.92	3.69	.78	4.47	.60			3.86	.85
..tries a variety of teaching techniques	3.50	1.15	3.63	.79	4.58	.88			3.77	1.01
..respects students	3.80	1.01	3.84	.80	4.58	.75			3.97	.91
..is approachable by students	3.73	.96	4.02	.85	4.58	.67			4.04	.91
..understands problems of students	3.80	1.05	3.98	.90	4.53	.60			4.03	.93
..is well informed on community problems & issues	4.17	.86	4.14	.74	4.58	.67			4.23	.79
..grades fairly on a reasonable standard	3.73	1.15	3.73	.93	4.37	.87			3.85	1.02
..is flexible and open-minded	4.00	1.10	3.92	.79	4.58	.67			4.07	.91
..is clear and definite about course objectives	3.70	.94	3.37	.97	3.95	.69			3.58	.94
..knows the subject matter	3.93	1.00	3.71	.82	4.32	.65			3.89	.88

Name of Intern (06)

College

TABLE 9

This instructor compared to instructors in general......									Total	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
..is able to make subject interesting	3.18	1.34	3.19	.50	3.91	.51	3.63	.93	3.44	.89
..tries a variety of teaching techniques	3.73	.86	3.05	.84	3.55	.78	4.06	.83	3.54	.93
..respects students	3.09	1.08	3.19	.79	3.18	.94	3.69	.85	3.31	.93
..is approachable by students	2.82	1.03	2.86	.77	3.45	.66	3.75	.75	3.20	.90
..understands problems of students	2.73	.96	3.33	.84	3.09	1.16	3.38	.78	3.19	.95
..is well informed on community problems & issues	3.36	.77	3.48	.91	3.45	1.16	4.06	1.03	3.61	1.01
..grades fairly on a reasonable standard	3.46	.78	3.48	.91	3.36	.64	4.13	.86	3.64	.88
..is flexible and open-minded	2.73	1.05	3.00	.69	3.82	1.27	3.88	.78	3.34	1.04
..is clear and definite about course objectives	3.55	1.16	3.43	.96	3.82	.72	4.00	.94	3.68	.98
..knows the subject matter	3.82	.72	3.52	.91	4.18	.83	4.13	.99	3.86	.93

Name of Intern (07)

College

TABLE 10

This instructor compared to instructors in general......									Total	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
..is able to make subject interesting .	2.96	.79	3.33	.75	3.25	.43			3.12	.77
..tries a variety of teaching techniques	3.70	.94	3.39	1.06	4.00	.71			3.61	.99
..respects students	3.63	.55	3.67	.75	3.75	.83			3.65	.66
..is approachable by students	3.52	.63	3.78	.92	4.50	.50			3.69	.79
..understands problems of students	3.41	.62	3.61	.68	3.75	.83			3.51	.67
..is well informed on community problems & issues	4.00	.82	4.28	.56	3.75	.83			4.08	.75
..grades fairly on a reasonable standard	3.37	.82	3.11	.81	3.75	1.30			3.31	.89
..is flexible and open-minded	3.22	.88	3.28	.87	3.75	.43			3.29	.86
..is clear and definite about course objectives	3.33	.82	3.39	1.01	4.25	1.09			3.43	.95
..knows the subject matter	3.67	.86	3.44	1.07	3.50	.50			3.57	.93

Name of Intern (10)

College

TABLE 11

This instructor compared to instructors in general......									Total	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
..is able to make subject interesting	3.78	.92	3.61	.69	4.03	.77			3.80	.82
..tries a variety of teaching techniques	4.33	.75	4.33	.68	4.34	.73			4.34	.72
..respects students	4.39	.76	3.85	.93	4.38	.74			4.21	.85
..is approachable by students	4.31	.74	3.88	1.15	4.53	.66			4.24	.91
..understands problems of students	4.28	.77	4.03	.90	4.56	.50			4.29	.78
..is well informed on community problems & issues	3.56	.69	3.30	.72	3.53	.75			3.47	.73
..grades fairly on a reasonable standard	4.17	.87	3.70	.76	4.22	.89			4.03	.87
..is flexible and open-minded	4.25	.64	4.30	.80	4.66	.59			4.40	.71
..is clear and definite about course objectives	3.61	.89	3.61	.85	3.72	.91			3.64	.89
..knows the subject matter	3.75	.80	3.82	.87	3.75	.87			3.77	.84

Name of Intern (11) ______________________

College ______________________

TABLE 12

This instructor compared to instructors in general......									Total	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
..is able to make subject interesting	3.58	.76	3.77	.76	4.17	.69			3.85	.77
..tries a variety of teaching techniques	3.75	.72	3.14	.76	3.67	.75			3.40	.80
..respects students	4.33	.62	3.57	.69	4.17	.69			3.88	.76
..is approachable by students	4.17	.90	3.60	.80	4.33	.58			3.91	.84
..understands problems of students	3.83	.69	3.34	.58	4.22	.63			3.68	.73
..is well informed on community problems & issues	3.92	.64	4.03	.65	4.22	.63			4.06	.65
..grades fairly on a reasonable standard	3.42	.64	3.51	.65	3.83	.76			3.58	.70
..is flexible and open-minded	4.33	.47	3.60	.99	4.28	.80			3.92	.93
..is clear and definite about course objectives	3.92	.76	3.69	.85	3.94	.71			3.80	.81
..knows the subject matter	4.25	.72	4.09	.77	4.17	.76			4.14	.76

Name of Intern (12)

College

TABLE 13

This instructor compared to instructors in general......									Total	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
..is able to make subject interesting.	3.50	.50	3.50	.69	3.38	.70	3.30	.82	3.41	.70
..tries a variety of teaching techniques	3.92	.81	3.54	.63	4.04	.79	3.53	.92	3.74	.83
..respects students	4.54	.58	4.27	.71	4.38	.70	4.40	.71	4.39	.69
..is approachable by students	4.79	.50	4.54	.57	4.33	.85	4.43	.67	4.52	.68
..understands problems of students	4.50	.65	4.35	.78	4.29	.84	4.37	.80	4.38	.77
..is well informed on community problems & issues	3.58	.64	3.65	.78	3.63	.63	3.73	.77	3.65	.72
..grades fairly on a reasonable standard	4.00	.65	3.96	.76	3.67	.75	3.77	.62	3.85	.70
..is flexible and open-minded	4.58	.57	4.42	.57	4.42	.64	4.10	.65	4.37	.64
..is clear and definite about course objectives	3.13	.88	3.31	.82	3.17	.75	3.23	.80	3.21	.82
..knows the subject matter	3.38	.63	3.69	.82	3.67	.62	3.90	.83	3.67	.77

Name of Intern (13)

College

TABLE 14

This instructor compared to instructors in general......									Total	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
..is able to make subject interesting.	2.50	1.12	3.09	.79	3.06	1.09	3.08	1.14	3.00	1.06
..tries a variety of teaching techniques	2.50	.76	3.18	.72	3.44	1.00	3.00	.39	3.13	.82
..respects students	3.50	1.26	4.00	.74	4.06	.83	3.31	.46	3.76	.86
..is approachable by students	3.33	1.25	4.27	.86	4.13	.99	3.15	.36	3.78	1.00
..understands problems of students	3.00	1.00	4.00	.95	4.13	.86	3.00	.56	3.64	.99
..is well informed on community problems & issues	4.00	.58	4.55	.99	4.25	.83	3.69	.72	4.13	.88
..grades fairly on a reasonable standard	3.33	.94	3.82	.72	3.69	1.04	2.92	.62	3.46	.93
..is flexible and open-minded	3.67	.75	3.64	.98	3.75	1.20	3.08	.62	3.52	.99
..is clear and definite about course objectives	2.50	.76	3.55	.78	3.19	1.24	2.77	.58	3.07	.99
..knows the subject matter	3.33	.75	4.00	.85	3.69	1.04	3.08	.73	3.54	.95

Name of Intern (15)

College

TABLE 15

This instructor compared to instructors in general......									Total	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
..is able to make subject interesting.	4.19	.79							4.19	.79
..tries a variety of teaching techniques	4.19	.74							4.19	.74
..respects students	4.42	.63							4.42	.63
..is approachable by students	4.35	.78							4.35	.78
..understands problems of students	4.35	.73							4.35	.73
..is well informed on community problems & issues	4.46	.69							4.46	.69
..grades fairly on a reasonable standard	3.96	.71							3.96	.71
..is flexible and open-minded	4.35	.62							4.35	.62
..is clear and definite about course objectives	4.12	1.05							4.12	1.05
..knows the subject matter	4.19	.79							4.19	.79

Name of Intern (16)

College

TABLE 16

This instructor compared to instructors in general......									Total	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
..is able to make subject interesting	4.00	.71							4.00	.71
..tries a variety of teaching techniques	3.58	1.12							3.58	1.12
..respects students	4.58	.95							4.58	.95
..is approachable by students	4.17	1.07							4.17	1.07
..understands problems of students	4.00	.91							4.00	.91
..is well informed on community problems & issues	3.67	.75							3.67	.75
..grades fairly on a reasonable standard	4.17	1.28							4.17	1.28
..is flexible and open-minded	4.08	.86							4.08	.86
..is clear and definite about course objectives	3.83	.90							3.83	.90
..knows the subject matter	4.00	1.08							4.00	1.08

Name of Intern (17)____________________

College__________________________

TABLE 17

This instructor compared to instructors in general......									Total	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
..is able to make subject interesting	3.91	.79	4.27	.73					4.17	.76
..tries a variety of teaching techniques	3.54	.50	3.83	.73					3.76	.69
..respects students	3.18	.83	3.87	.92					3.68	.95
..is approachable by students	3.73	1.21	4.30	.97					4.15	1.07
..understands problems of students	3.46	.89	4.53	.81					4.24	.96
..is well informed on community problems & issues	3.46	.78	4.33	.75					4.10	.85
..grades fairly on a reasonable standard	3.55	.78	4.03	.84					3.90	.85
..is flexible and open-minded	3.36	.77	4.37	.88					4.10	.96
..is clear and definite about course objectives	3.64	.77	3.80	1.05					3.76	.98
..knows the subject matter	3.91	1.00	4.30	.94					4.20	.97

TABLE 18

Interns as a Group; Mean of the Means for each Item

Intern → Item	02 Mean	03 Mean	04 Mean	05 Mean	06 Mean	07 Mean	10 Mean	11 Mean	12 Mean	13 Mean	15 Mean	16 Mean	17 Mean	Total Mean	Total SD
22	4.38	3.75	3.93	3.86	3.44	3.12	3.80	3.85	3.41	3.00	4.19	4.00	4.17	3.76	.40
23	4.04	3.81	3.88	3.77	3.54	3.61	4.34	3.40	3.74	3.13	4.19	3.58	3.76	3.75	.31
24	4.46	4.13	4.16	3.97	3.31	3.65	4.21	3.88	4.39	3.76	4.42	4.58	3.68	4.05	.36
25	4.67	4.50	4.50	4.04	3.20	3.69	4.24	3.91	4.52	3.78	4.35	4.17	4.15	4.13	.39
26	4.42	4.25	4.45	4.03	3.19	3.51	4.29	3.68	4.38	3.64	4.35	4.00	4.24	4.03	.39
27	4.46	4.06	3.96	4.23	3.61	4.08	3.47	4.06	3.65	4.13	4.46	3.67	4.10	4.00	.31
28	4.33	4.13	3.54	3.85	3.64	3.31	4.03	3.58	3.85	3.46	3.96	4.17	3.90	3.83	.29
29	4.71	4.31	4.21	4.07	3.34	3.29	4.40	3.92	4.37	3.52	4.35	4.08	4.10	4.05	.41
30	4.46	3.19	3.63	3.58	3.68	3.43	3.64	3.80	3.21	3.07	4.12	3.83	3.76	3.65	.37
31	4.54	4.25	3.82	3.89	3.86	3.57	3.77	4.14	3.67	3.54	4.19	4.00	4.20	3.96	.28

Commentary, cont: Some patterns of disagreement can be detected when the evaluations of the EFs, Deans and students are contrasted and compared. On the matter of "subject matter control", each of the interns evaluators see control in a different light, apparently. Probably, the most reliable assessment would be that of the EF. Another matter, which cannot be explored satisfactorily here because of limitations of time and space, is the discrepancy that appears between EF and students rating for several of the interns. One case in particular is intriguing: the EF accords the intern glowing praise, while the students compare him favorably with other instructors, but not with such a degree of enthusiasm. This kind of discrepancy does not suggest that one or other of the evaluators is in error. It does demonstrate that there are inevitable differences in perception that arise from the relationship of the evaluated to the evaluator. This is a fact of life which must be taken fully into consideration in the evaluation of participants in an internship type program, especially, when the participants themselves may represent a "new wave," insofar as curriculum and methodology are concerned. The circumstance mentioned above could be exactly reversed. In fact, that pattern can be discerned in the evaluation of several interns.

INTERNS EVALUATION OF THE CIP

Changing the focus from an evaluation of the interns to the program, how did the interns evaluate the CIP? This question is difficult to answer in any rigorous way, for what may be conveniently described under the rubric, "CIP" or "the program" is in actuality a complex of people, events, attitudes, histories and is perceived differently by different interns. What is to one intern a very valuable aspect of the program is of only passing interest to another. What appears to be of little interest to an intern early on in the program later becomes of central interest. Yet, this conclusion is clear: the interns have a uniformly positive feeling for the program, valued some aspects of it very highly, and consider it to have been a very good program, very useful to them.

Why did interns generally like the program? Perhaps because of the personalized nature of the program and the high "faculty" - intern ratio, attachments were formed, and friendly relationships developed. Warm feelings toward the program were no doubt bolstered by the prevalent feeling that for many interns there would have been no teaching position without the program. The stipends induced positive feeling. The program was perceived as useful. Further, the interns came to feel that it was "their" program.

On certain specifics, intern opinion divided, as for instance on the question of formality of structure in program planning. A few were sharply critical of what was perceived as too much permissiveness, while others praised the sense of freedom and personal responsibility that the program gave them.

By and large, the reasons for describing the program in positive terms clustered around these attributes:

a. facilitation of job getting; "...opened the door to teaching..."

b. interaction with other interns and CIP team, an "uplifting" experience which also brought exposure to new ideas, tested conviction, led to understanding of the problems of others, and promoted self awareness,communication skill,

c. pre-service session, which brought a state of "readiness" to enter teaching, gave practice for teaching with the video tape,

d. personal attention, support from the CIP staff and specialists, concern and commitment, constructive criticisms of classroom observations,

e. multi-cultural makeup of the group,

f. encouraging attitudes of experiment, innovation, the spirit that there are those who care about improvement of instruction, legitimating individual intern's feeling of appropriateness in being different, flexibility in program design, permitting attention to immediate problems, absence of "pedagese" and lectures,

g. relevance to societal needs in relation to community colleges.

Criticism of the program, pointing out aspects perceived as negative, tended to cluster around these attributes:

a. academic demand not rigorous enough, not enough "meat" in some presentations

b. too much time spent in discussion, group activities, and not enough time with specialists and staff in substantive discussion, or generally, an inefficient or "poor" use of time

c. need for additional minority representation in the CIP especially needed being Chicano, women

d. insufficient time to delve deeply into conflicting educational viewpoints

Paradoxes and cross purposes encountered in the 1969-70 program appeared again. The call for more structure was countered by the criticism that too much structure existed. The request for more attention to the "how-to" aspects of teaching was countered by the request that more time be spent in philosophical discussion. Those urging more group dynamics and interpersonal relations contradicted those who argued that such "pointless" discussions were of little value. And there are more. The conclusion to be drawn is that a program like the CIP will serve a group that is relatively homogenous in many ways but is also heterogenous in other important respects. Thus, the program must strive to be as comprehensive as possible in the points that it touches, and sufficiently flexible in its structure to accede to modification by participants when and where appropriate. Probably the recurrent paradoxes are endemic in enterprises of this nature. Because they relate very directly to the classroom, CIP turned the otherwise hampering paradoxes to some advantage by making them items on the agenda for intern discussion.

The diversity of perceptions regarding the value of aspects of the program demonstrates that individual interns will find individual aspects of the program of more value than others, but that there is no clear pattern of one aspect that overshadows the others. It may be concluded that the CIP was successful in its attempt to exemplify personalized, individualized instruction, in the recognition that individuals learn differently, have different needs, and they change with experience over time.

Responses to several of the questions on the Participant Evaluation Form are interesting. Generally, they substantiate other evidence attesting to the intern's positive appraisal of the program. In rating the overall quality of the program, on a five point scale, 80% of the interns found the program "outstanding," or "very good," while 22% thought it "good". None rated it as only "adequate" nor "poor." As the training in professional work of the program related to their own careers, 70% rated the program at the top of the scale as "very useful." 30% found it "fairly useful," and none rated it as "not at all useful."

TABLE V about here

TABLE 19

INTERNS RATINGS OF SELECTED PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS:
PARTICIPANT EVALUATION, OE FORM 1216

	Out-Standing	Very Good	Good	Adequate	Poor	No Response/ Not Apply
Quality of curriculum	20	45	25	-	-	10
Quality of internship	40	50	-	-	-	10
Administrative arrangements; quality of learning atmosphere created	25	40	10	10	-	15
Administrative arrangements; effectiveness of time schedule of activities	20	30	35	-	-	15
Quality of full-time teaching staff	50	20	10	-	-	20
Quality of part-time teaching staff	25	35	15	-	-	25
Quality of consultants	35	25	30	-	-	10

INTERNS EVALUATION OF THE CIP, cont.

A summary of the intern's ratings of certain of the program characteristics provides more evidence of their positive attitude. Also, the summary illustrates in the distribution of responses the selectively critical judgements of the intern. It must be pointed out that the questionnaire puzzled many of the interns who found it hard to respond in categories perceived as inapplicable. For instance, what was the "curriculum" of the CIP? Those answering from a conventional course-work frame of mind would have difficulty, since in many important ways, the curriculum of the CIP was in fact the intern himself and his self-study. The "quality of internship" would be answered from the context of the on-campus environment as much as from the context of the CIP per se. The items touching on "staffing" were difficult to answer since the CIP team was not seen as a teaching staff.

USING THE OMNIBUS PERSONALITY INVENTORY

The Omnibus Personality Inventory (OPI) was administered midway through the pre-service institute in August. A second administration of the well known instrument was planned for late in the spring. The pre and post results were to be evaluated and interpreted by Dr. Paul Heist, Professor of Higher Education at Berkeley, and prominent authority in personality testing.

Although the CIP team were fully aware of the serious reservations minority group members have concerning "culture bound" instruments, it was determined that several important goals would be served and make the project worthwhile. By taking the inventory at the outset of the program, then near its conclusion, the intern could see changes in his profile, if any, as well as the distinctive patterns of his own responses. Such data would be of value in evaluating the impact of the program and the internship experience.

Late in May, Paul Heist met with the interns to discuss personality assessment through self-reporting questionnaires, the concept of the "profile," and, discussed profiles with interested individuals. Though there was considerable interest among individual interns in their profiles, the group as a whole did not favor the second taking of the inventory. Thus,"before and after" data is not available.

It should be noted that the CIP decided early in the first year that no form of testing would be required as part of the application process. The critical response of the intern to the testing concept validates that decision. But, that does not preclude the value of a well designed pre and post testing project for program evaluation for program participants, assuming that they are fully aware of the purposes of the project and have a participatory role in its design.

DESCRIPTION AND EVALUATION OF THE PAJARO DUNES GROUP PROCESS WEEKEND*

> "Our feeling is that the growth potential of teachers, just as with children, is unlimited, and that the development of group process approaches is one design in which such teacher potential can be realized."
>
> Quote from The Lonely Teacher,
> Peter Knoblock and Arnold Goldstein

---

*Steven A. Brown, Associate Director

Goals of the Evaluation Project

In keeping with a basic premise of the CIP - that is, that teaching/learning is above all else an interactive activity - one of the major features of the 1970-71 program was a replication of the "group process weekend" held in the spring of the 1969-70 program. The activities of the weekend were directed toward two primary goals. One, to bring to the participants increased awareness that the educational process is one in which personal interaction takes place in class - which in fact are groups. A teacher wishing to promote maximum learning needs to be knowledgeable about group process and skillful in the use of group process techniques. Two, to aid the participants in the realization that in process involving human interaction, each individual engaged in the process needs to know himself and be cognizant of the perceptions others have of him. A concommitant hope (if not expectation) was that the weekend in all its elements - participants, timing, duration, setting, format, - would provide not only for increased awareness and knowledge, but also for maximum opportunity where these could be individually tried and tested.

Assumptions: A basic assumption underlying the plan for the weekend was that learning about group processes effectively occurs through participation in a structured or focused group experience. Another, that group processes, like swimming, must be practiced to be learned. Further, that the size of the group is important, being small enough to encourage active participation. A central, agreed upon task was assumed; that the prupose was to learn about group process and how it ramifies into learning in and out of the classroom setting. Around this task was to revolve intensive interaction (discussion/work activity) and reflection (discussion and analysis of what had been taking place).

Planning: Interns from 1969-70 stressed the value of their group experience, so in planning for 1970-71, this program component was given greater prominence. During recruitment and selection interviews, the topic was discussed, and was re-introduced during the pre-service institute when the interaction exercise was conducted. At the pre-service institute, a date for late spring was set for a group experience weekend.

In mid-January, arrangements for the site were completed, also the search for appropriate facilitators. This is always a chancey process due to the unknowns in group mix. The selection of facilitators turned out to be quite fortuitous. Six were located, whose interests and experience coincided with CIP objectives for the weekend and were known by one of the staff consultants. They had worked together a great deal, thus were familiar (and compatible) with each other's styles of operation. The CIP staff and the six facilitators met some weeks prior to the event, agreed on the basic program for the weekend, and from that point, the activities of the weekend came under the guidance of the facilitating team.

At the Saturday seminar on February 20, four of the team met with the CIP interns and staff to discuss the workshop, and to arrive at final agreement about the goals and how these would be worked at. From the conversation at the meeting, it was clear that many of the interns were anxious about the weekend, and its potential effect on them. An overlay of negative response to seemingly neutral terminology - "group process training", for example - brought out the degree of unease, or outright hostility felt by many. The facilitators attempted to reinforce their intent that the experience emphasize learning, as contrasted with therapy; that the central goal was to aid understanding of how people behave in groups, particularly conventional learning (classroom) groups; that while openess of expression was to be encouraged, it would be directed at effective communication, rather than depth encounter. The predispositon of some of the participants made them

Planning, cont: skeptical that this would be the case, a fact which became evident when some whom were most negatively vocal did not take part in the weekend. Following the meeting on February 20, the Director and Associate Director divided the group into three smaller units consisting of seven interns, two staff, and two facilitators, each. In setting up the groups, an attempt was made to modify a random selection so that maximum interaction would take place in each group. As far as possible, groups were arranged to provide proportional representation as to sex and ethnicity.

The Setting: Accomodations consisted of six individual houses, located on the beach within a few minutes walk of each other. The assumption was that the separateness of the houses would permit a degree of privacy for sleeping, or just being alone, not possible in a more conventional large-group setting. The quiet of the ocean, too, would hopefully contribute to the atmosphere, encouraging close interaction, introspection, reflection.

One of the houses, centrally located, having a large living room, would serve as the assembly point, large meeting area, and dining room; the participant groups would designate three of the remaining houses as their indoor gathering points. Participants would select their own places to sleep.

Outline of the Weekend:

Participants: *15 interns; 2 staff; 4 staff consultants; 6 facilitators
*6 interns of the 21 did not attend

Outline of the Weekend, cont:

Setting: Pajaro Dunes: a beach community in which commodious private homes are available for rental for recreation and/or conference use. Catered group meal service is available (we used it). The atmosphere is one of relaxed privacy, in warm, comfortable surroundings.

Timing: The session took place in mid-March. The intent was to engage the interns in the experience late enough in the year that they would be in their second term of teaching (and hopefully under less stress than during the first term).

Duration: Arrival was timed for mid-afternoon on Friday - departure, mid-afternoon on Sunday.

Format:

Friday afternoon:	Informal get-togegher
Friday evening:	Large group meeting - "Why are we here?", "How are we going to do it?"
	Small group meeting - "Doing it"
Saturday morning:	Small group meeting - "Doing it"
Saturday afternoon:	Small group meeting - "Doing it"
Saturday evening:	Free - socializing
Sunday morning:	Small group meeting - Assessment

What Happened?

Friday afternoon was a time for renewing friendships, talking about the trials and triumphs of the three weeks since the last Saturday seminar, and winding down from another busy week. The atmosphere was one of congeniality, even convivality, with inklings of anxious anticipation present in almost everyone. Dinner was followed by the re-introduction of the facilitators, who then "Opened" the more formal procedings. Briefly reviewing the objectives, then setting out the proposed program of the weekend, they put forth some standard ground rules: the call for openess, here-and-now talk, as opposed to anecdote or history; self-expression, rather than interpretation of others and so forth.

The groups then moved to their selected houses and began the business which was to occupy them physically, cognitively, and emotionally for the next two days. From this point, the weekend became even more an experience identifiable only by and with each individual. Consistent with the understanding that individuals, thus groups of individuals, are in the last analysis, self-directing, the facilitators encouraged "their" groups to be themselves, and to use the program format, or not use it, as appropriate for them. The facilitators had designed a core of experiences and exercises which they felt would contribute to the functioning of the groups, but they viewed these as starting points, not as ends, or essentials.

The groups ended that first evening around ten. Some of the participants continued conversations begun in the groups, some walked the beach, some partied, some went to sleep. Some moved to initiate, build, or cement relationships; some used the time for solitude. The facilitators had a chance to compare notes on the happenings within their groups, a process which they repeated many times throughout the weekend, as they sought to be most effective.

Saturday was a continuation of Friday night. There were small group sessions both moring and afternoon, where the initial interactions of the previous evening were deepened. Some alternates to strictly verbal communication were used in attempt to put the participants at more ease with one another. One such was a building game, in which the object (on the surface) was the replication of a tinker-toy construction. Many deeper messages were taken from the exercise, such as how the individuals in the group dealt with a venture requiring cooperation, or with "expertise", or the non-participant. Good weather encouraged getting out on the beach; football games, running, walking and talking provided for different ways for the groups to interact.

Saturday evening was scheduled for free time,with the understanding that there would probably be a party. At least one group was still heavily involved past the time the party was to have begun, so there were a couple of gatherings, which finally merged about ten o'clock. The party was not altogether successful, at least not as a social event. Because of the interaction between group members, there was reluctance to break off things begun earlier. Probably the largest single damper as the overbalance of men. One of the participants was heard to compare the dance floor (unfavorably) with a high school stag line.

What Happened, cont.

Sunday morning was set aside for reflection on the previous day and a half. It was at this point that the participants were encouraged to give feedback to others in their groups. Here was the opportunity to tell of the good and/or not so good feelings present after nearly forty eight hours of intense interaction, and perhaps to try to talk about the meaning of the experience. Then...the final lunch, last walks on the beach..."I'll see you at ..." Each took his own way, the ride back, to prepare for Monday's classes, to greet excited children, to complete the break with a fiance, to ponder the significanc of parts of the self discovered.

Evaluation

Evaluation of a training program of this sort is difficult. These questions need answers:

What happened to the participants,
How are theydifferent, having been through the experience,
Are there other ways in which the same, or more meaningful, changes could have been brought about, Was it worth the time, effort, money?

It is evident that even a thoroughly comprehensive and expensive research design, answers would be elusive. Despite the difficulties hampering any evaluation effort, such as the recency of the experience, absence of control group and long term data, this evaluation project has obtained data adequate for answering, in part, these questions.

Evaluation, cont.

Methodology: Within the week following the event, the participants and the non-participants in the intern group were asked to respond to a three item questionnaire designed to elicit expressions of feeling about the experience. Participants were asked what they had anticipated before the weekend, how they felt about it now that they had been through it, and whether, and how, the experience influenced their own teaching.

Non-participants were asked to comment on their anticipations, why they elected not to participate, and what they felt about not participating. Of the fifteen participants, eight replied; of the six non-participants, two replied. These responses led to the development of an interview protocol to be used in the second and more important phase of the evaluation project, the depth interviews of the participants.

To conduct the interviews, a participant in the 1969-70 CIP was employed. Familiar with the experiences confronting an intern, aware of program objectives, and sensitive to the subtlties of reaction to the interaction weekend, she assisted in the development of the protocol and conducted the interviews. (See Appendix K for interview protocol).

The protocol amplified the questions asked on the first questionnaire, and provided a format from which the interviewer lead the participants into a discussion of their feelings about the weekend. Essentially, the protocol was open-ended, though detailed in the probe questions. The hope was that it would provide data adequate for comparisons of responses. (See Appendix L for participant's assessments in summary form).

Methodology, cont: The interviews were scheduled to be an hour's length, at places convenient to the participants. Each interview was audio-taped. At the conclusion, interviewer noted immediate impressions. Later she reviewed the tapes adding to her initial notes, thus developing for each interview a composite, summary statement and analysis. This helpful though time consuming process enabled the interviewer to report in an appropriate manner her own insights on the responses. A similar procedure was intended to collect data from non-participants, but it was not possible to do so.

Differential Response: The most notable finding is that there is tremendous range of response among the participants. (See appendix L for a condensation of participant responses presented in a summary, table form). Some interns reported a high anticipation of the weekend, thus, "I was really looking forward to the weekend. I expected that we could learn alot about how groups behave." Others said they felt neutral. Some were negative, "I went only out of obligation. I was hoping that maybe I would get some help to be a better teacher." Most expressed anxiety about this new experience.

Participants who initially expressed anticipation for the weekend seemed to come away disappointed. For some, it was because they were looking for a cerebral experience; "I went, thinking we were going to be having cognitive discussions of group process. What we got was group encounter. I feel misled." By contrast, participants who initially expressed skepticism, or distrust, seemed to come away feeling good about the experience. Not all had the same reasons, to be sure, but most of this group felt that the experience was valuable for them; "I expected an encounter group, which would tear people apart. Instead, my group developed a warm atmosphere. It was very valuable, and I think that

Differential Response, cont:

> "I think that the group leaders (facilitators) were walking on eggs around the race question, trying to avoid an issue."

Another intern said:

> "The facilitators didn't know when games were being run on them." (by the black interns)

Once again, interns expressed widely differing impressions, both as to the worth of the experience, and as to what made it worthwhile.

As was noted above, those who looked forward to the experience and had little anxiety generally were not satisfied. It did not meet their felt needs. As one said:

> "I went into the experience with high expectations. They were not fulfilled." (The interviewer was not able to get the respondant to be specific about what it was the intern had been expecting to take place.)

For those who felt that the weekend was valuable, there was one thread that seemed to weave most of their reasons together. The positive results were all associated with some form of direct, personal growth. Very few stated that they learned much about group process, and almost none saw a direct relationship between the group process training and their performance as teachers. (The reason for emphasis is that they all saw a direct connection between the personal growth aspects, and their teaching). For example, Differential Response, cont:

> "The atmosphere of acceptance radiated by the group, especially the facilitator, brought me to a point of feeling great personal liberation. I feel able to be much more sensitive to the needs of my students, but this doesn't have anything to do with group process... personal growth is what is helping me to become a better teacher."

The facilitators made a related observation, from a slightly different perspective: They agreed that for group process learning to have taken place, more time was required. One suggested that the session should have been longer. Two thought that another weekend, a week or two after the first would have provided for that aspect of the experience.

If the perceptions of the participants are accurate, most of the carryover was in terms of increased sense of self-awareness; that not much that would be identified as specific group-process learning occured.

Group Process and Teacher Training: The patterns of differential response was elicited by the question, should this kind of an experience be a part of teacher training programs? The staff, and those who feel that they got something outof it are in general agreement that this sort of learning is valuable. The responses of those interns who talk of changes in their personalities after such short exposure, Differential Response, cont: changes which they assert would not likely have come about in any other way, support the idea. In addition, as the staff and consultants observed the intern's teaching after the experience, it became clear that their perceptions were accurate. There were observable marked differences in the classroom manner of many of the interns...not all of those changes occuring in those who expressed positive feelings about the experience. However, that this should be a required part of every program has not been demonstrated. For one thing, the learning might well take place in other ways. (For most, this does not at present seem likely, but it is possible). For , the results described here are very short term. The perceptions were reported less than two months after the event; only three months have transpired as this is being written. More research is required before longrange benefit of such a program can be determined.

However, the indications are that this sort of learning experience is valuable; the question remains, "should it be required of all potential teachers?" One intern responds:

> "I went to the weekend with a negative attitude, had a poor opinion of encounter-type sessions, and felt that cognitive oriented learning was more productive. However, I now see the value of such sessions in teacher training."

Answering the question,"would you have attended if there had not been a sense of obligation?", the intern replied, "No. Absolutely, no."

CONCLUSIONS

It appears that the very nature of this type of training...unknown until it has been experienced, makes it threatening to many who can and do benefit from it. The objections to requiring attendance, or to making it an integral part of a trining program generally stem from the notion that a person does not benefit unless he has freely chosen to participate.

Should a similar experience be a usual part of teacher training programs? There are two approaches to answering this question one empirical, the other more philosophical.

The main argument agains making this sort of experience an integral regular part of a program comes from those who assert that participants do not benefit unless they have freely elected to participate. This position has common currency among the group process training trade, yet the self-report data cited here seems to refute that contention. Most of those attending who felt hostile, or antagonistic in advance of the experience report positive feelings having been through it. This seems to suggest that if the session is managed in a way appropriate to the task interest of the group, they will in fact benefit in other ways, ways which they might previously have decried, yet ways which they value.

The philosophical position is difficult to unravel. The questions become, "If one of the goals of the training program is to encourage teachers to value and nourish student initiative, is it not of central importance that the program be designed to exemplify that goal? And, "Is it possible to preach free-choice, and then to lay on requirements?" The answer to the first question msut be, "yes." to the second, "No." How then is it possible to set up a training program in which the goals are to encourage initiative and self-direction, and yet provide for experiences which are known to the staff to be valuable, but which may be strange, and threatening to participants?

The only answer to this seems perhaps to be weak, but no less true: provide for the experience in the design of the program. Encourage alot of discourse about the experience. Involve the group in planning for the event. Be as sure as possible that the staff is competent, and concurs with the goals of the project. Make sure that participants have the choice (and feel that they have it) as to whether to attend.

LONG RANGE EVALUATION

At this time no long range evaluation is being planned, though such would be useful. It would be interesting to know how the interns persist in the occupation of teaching, how leadership potential is fulfilled, how students and colleagues rate them in teaching performance over the years. Further, it would be of value to the larger question of faculty development to be able to trace the steps of the interns as they move toward or away from assimilation into the social system of the faculty.

LONG RANGE EVALUATION, cont.

An evaluation form for the 1969 interns who are still at the college of initial employment was sent to Deans of Instruction. The return was small, but positive. A reunion of 1969-70 interns was held during the fall of 1970. Attendance, strictly voluntary, was about 50%, though a number of interns were unavailable, or expressed the frustrated desire to attend. Informal evaluation through conversations with former EFs, Deans and Presidents of colleges employing interns is positive, and in several cases very enthusiastic.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Repeating the conclusions of the 1969-70 report, the most significant aspect of the program, is the attainment of its leading goal. The CIP has placed minority and non-minority instructors of outstanding potential. The CIP interns effectively instruct the broad spectrum of community college students. They work well with the "new" student, those of low income and/minority backgrounds.

It is significant that this federally funded program came into being coincidental with the recognition (belated) by the colleges of the pressing need for minority faculty, and the re-awakening of the profession to the need for the preparation of the community college isntructor. CIP appeared at a time of need, and served the colleges and students in a timely way. An outcome of the program's operation has been a resurrected interest, modest but important, of the concept of the "prepared instructor."

CONCLUSIONS, cont.

The model set by the CIP for program content and policies has been emulated by a few progressive institutions. Another outcome of the program is that of the 45 interns that have gone through the program, leaders are already beginning to emerge. Further, the CIP experience has brought into being a resevoir of experience, skills, and leadership in the persons of the CIP team and some of the EFs.

These may seem bold assertions considering the relatively small magnitude of the program. After all, only 45 CIP interns took their places among the some 18,000 instructors that man the California community colleges. Yet, ideas have power, and conditions can bring them into wide acceptance. Without being overly extravagent, it may be predicted that the next decade will bring a sustained and close interest to matters ofcurriculum, instruction, evaluation, learning, and the development of faculty to deal with these matters effectively. These are topics which have been in the shadow during the last decade of the topics of building, financing, organization, though they are at the heart of the teaching/learning enterprise. Not many faculty members are truly skilled in curriculum development, instructional strategies, variations on evaluation, and theories of learning. They will certainly need the vehicle of in-service programs to achieve, or renew, competence in these areas. It may be expected that the ripple effect of the CIP and its interns and similar programs will be of benefit to the community college movement in the decade to come.

MAJOR STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE PROGRAM

Two year's experience has proven the strength of the basic concepts and structure that underly the CIP. The concept of the pre-service, intensive warm-up session preceding a substantial reality experience as the foundation of the in-service phase has demonstrated its viability. Outstanding successes with several EFs has demonstrated that the role conceptualized the EF is within the realm of possibility. This is important, for it is now clear that the experienced faculty member is the pivotal figure for thorough going in-service programs. Experience shows that much groundwork must be done to define and animate the role.

Basically, the concept of internship itself has proven to have an intrinsic strength. Though the role, fully developed, is alien to the social system of almost every college, it has developed at a few colleges, to the benefit of the intern and the college alike. Certain attributes of the role can give it strenght, resilence and appeal. For instance, identification with a training program with the accompanying linkage to a reference group of fellow innovators and learners give the role a broad scope of association. The privilege of "released time" during initial stages of the experience to attend to personal development and familiarization with the college and its students speed the process of growth. Certainly, the concept cannot fully develop at colleges where financial stringencies preclude in the proper allocation of resources, nor can it thrive where defense of the status quo obstructs change. In candor, the experience of the CIP has not provided answers to the key questions of how to bring the role into being in hostile or indifferent surroundings, but the successes in conducive environments demonstrates the validity of the concept.

MAJOR STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE PROGRAM, cont.

Another strength of the program has been in the basic staffing pattern. The team approach of the specialists plus the CIP staff has made possible the circumstance in which interns could enjoy both general and specialized evaluation and consultation.

A part of the value of the CIP experience has been in the discovery of weaknesses in program design, conduct, policies and practices. Perhaps the most debilitating flaw in the program is that it must depend upon the job market for the placement of interns. A weakness in program design is the shortness of the pre-service institute. A three week institute would no doubt serve the needs of interns better. During the in-service phase, it was found that staff time was inadequate to provide as much field visits as were desired by the interns. Among the CIP team, there needed to be a broader representation of minority members, particularly women and Chicanos.

There is something of a paradox in the matter of strengths and weaknesses in the structure and operation of the program. Perhaps this paradox is best described in the words of one perceptive intern, who caught the message that the CIP team sought to get across;

> The strengths of the program often seem to be its weaknesses. For instance the interns were given a free-hand to develop as they saw fit, seeking advice, etc., when they wanted it and ignoring it in a like manner. This placed the burden upon the individual --- the intern --- to grow at the rate and in the manner which suited his discipline, tastes, etc.

MAJOR STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE PROGRAM, cont.

> I believe that this "looseness" was a more positive aspect --- because it gave me the freedom to "try" and "error" --- adjust to a new situation and continually repeat this sort of process. The freedom does not imply neglect --- counsel could be found at a moment's notice --- but it was my decision when to ask for it.

PROBLEMS THAT DESERVE ATTENTION BECAUSE THEY HAVE NOT BEEN SOLVED

Certain problems vexed the program and its staff. These same problems that will vex the profession when it moves seriously into the matter of pre- and in- service development of new and experienced faculty. Several of these might be mentioned, as a kind of an unfinished (unfinishable?) agenda:

1. How can the role of EF be defined and brought into vigorous life?
2. How can the concept of the "prepared instructor" be widely disseminated and made to prevail?
3. How can minority faculty who are progressive and militant enough to positively effect students be gotten past college hiring procedures that perceive them as "dangerous?"
4. How can a training program capture a balance in program content between "practical and theoretical" considerations, between work in the affective and the cognitive domains?

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

As the CIP is discontinuing operation after its second year, there can be no fruitful discussion of recommendations for program changes. Yet, the experience of the program does point to certain important areas in which a successor or comparable program would profitably work.

Organizational Basis: An organizational basis needs to be devised which makes the initiation and maintainence of the training program an important concern of the participating colleges. It may be that a consortium of cooperating colleges, each contributing to program costs and guaranteeing intern positions would be a suitable basis. The University operated program lacks the means of ensuring college commitments necessary for the vitality of a training program. Additionally, the purposes of the program - its mission - properly belongs in the province of the member colleges, as a logical and rightful aspect of professional responsibility.

Lengthen and Broaden the Program: Effective recruitment of the interns could well begin in undergraduate years, and participation could continue on through graduate school. A program might conceptualize a two year graduate internship, with partial teaching loads and financial support during the period of completion of graduate work. The program could be deepened by provisions for teaching assistantships early in the program, directed teaching, exchange teaching (with other colleges in a training consortium).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, cont.

Eliminate Wasteful Recruitment Practices: To try to anticipate the needs of far flung colleges by developing a large and diversified roster of recommended candidates is basically wasteful. Better to obtain from the colleges a commitment to earmark several faculty positions (to fill sabbaticals, for instance), to be let float to the area of greatest need. Then, the program and the college would collaborate on the recruitment of prospective interns.

APPENDIX A

List of 1970-71 Interns; Placement and Assignments

APPENDIX A

COOPERATIVE INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

INTERN ROSTER

NAME	COLLEGE	SUBJECT
Baker, Joel L.	City College San Francisco 50 Phelan Ave. San Francisco, Calif.	Counselor, New Careers Program
Erokwu, Ani	City College San Francisco 50 Phelan Ave. San Francisco, Calif.	Minority Business, Accounting
Hamilton, Charles	College of Marin Kentfield, Calif.	Afro-American Literature
Hickerson, Robert	Laney College 1001 Third Ave. Oakland, Calif.	English, Reading Workshop
Keller, Gordon	Laney College 1001 Third Ave. Oakland, Calif.	Drama
Lopez, Marcus	Cabrillo College 6500 Soquel Dr. Aptos, Calif.	Spanish, English
MacRenato, Ternot	City College San Francisco 50 Phelan Ave. San Francisco, Calif.	Political Science, Chicano Studies
Martinez, Oscar	Foothill College 12345 El Monte Rd. Los Altos Hills, Calif.	Chicano History

COOPERATIVE INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

INTERN ROSTER

NAME	COLLEGE	SUBJECT
Mason, Phillip	Laney College 1001 Third Ave. Oakland, Calif.	Art, Black Art
McEady, Betty	College of Alameda 555 Atlantic Alameda, Calif.	Reading, English
Moore, Richard A.	Chabot College 25555 Hesperian Blvd. Hayward, Calif.	Counselor, Coordinator Student Activities
Moran, Myrna	Foothill College 12345 El Monte Rd. Los Altos Hills, Calif.	Mathematics, Chemistry
Nakano, May	Ohlone 650 Washington Blvd. Fremont, Calif.	English
Parry, Sandra	San Joaquin Delta 3301 Kensington Way Stockton, Calif.	History, Art History
Rubiales, David	Yuba College Beale Rd. Marysville, Calif.	Mexican History, U.S. Histo
Thelin, Peter	West Valley 44 East Latimer Ave. Campbell, Calif.	Economics

COOPERATIVE INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

INTERN ROSTER

NAME	COLLEGE	SUBJECT
Thompson, Willie	City College San Francisco 50 Phelan Ave. San Francisco, Calif.	Sociology
Tregle, Linda	San Joaquin Delta 3301 Kensington Way Stockton, Calif.	Afro-Haitian Dance, Physical Education
Ward, Carole	Laney College 1001 Third Ave. Oakland, Calif.	Black Culture, Art
Warrick, Thurban	Laney College 1001 Third Ave. Oakland, Calif.	Physical Education
Wesson, Kenneth	San Jose City College 2100 Moorpark Ave. San Jose, Calif. 95114	Black Psychology

APPENDIX B

Application Procedures: Cooperative Internship Program

1970-1971

APPLICATION PROCEDURES

COOPERATIVE INTERNSHIP PROGRAM
1970-71

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Cooperative Internship Program coordinates application materials required by several sources. Before employment at a cooperating college has been finally completed, application materials will have been gathered for the following:

1. Graduate Division, University of California, Berkeley
2. State Department of Education (Credential Application)
3. Educational Career Services, University of California, Berkeley, (materials for placement file)
4. U.S. Office of Education
5. CIP application

Further, the intern will be asked to supply certain materials to colleges who are interested in employing an intern. What specific materials will be required will vary from college to college.

CIP will coordinate the application materials, except those requested directly by an interested college. All materials should be returned directly to:

Director
Cooperative Internship Program
4615B Tolman Hall
University of California,
Berkeley, California 94720

Our telephone number is (415) 642-0740, should questions arise.

The purpose of this instruction sheet is to clarify instructions.

APPLICATION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, GRADUATE DIVISION
University of California, Berkeley

Each intern will be enrolled in the Department of Education, Graduate Division, University of California, Berkeley, for the Fall Quarter, 1970, for nine quarter units of work.

Application is made by completing the form titled "Application for Admission, Graduate Division." Read the instructions carefully. But keep in mind that all materials are to be returned to the CIP office, despite what printed instructions might say. Also, keep in mind that the deadline for filing the application is May 15, 1970, so it is very important that the application be returned to us as soon as possible.

Transcripts: An application is not complete until transcripts have been received by us. Hence, it is very important that requests for transcripts be sent immediately to your colleges and/or universities. Please request that three copies be sent to the CIP office. One set will be transmitted to the Graduate Division. Another set will be sent with the Credential application to the State Department of Education, and the third set will be retained in the CIP files.

In the Graduate Division application instructions, you will find labels for the various colleges and/or universities that you send to for transcripts. Do not use these labels, as they are addressed to the Graduate Division. Instead, clearly instruct the registrar to whom you have written to send the transcripts to the CIP office. Use the CIP labels enclosed.

Letters of Recommendation: Do not use the letter of recommendation forms provided in the printed phamphlet. Letters of recommendation are required to complete a CIP application. But, use the forms provided by the Office of Educational Career Services. Persons asked to provide letters should be clearly instructed to return the letters to the CIP office in the self addressed return envelopes provided.

To Registrar:

Please attach this label to the official transcript of my record to be forwarded to:

Director,
Cooperative Internship Program
4615B Tolman Hall
University of California,
Berkeley, California 94720

in support of my application for admission to the CIP. Thank you.

Date:__________ Name:______________________________
Family Name First Middle

To Registrar:

Please attach this label to the official transcript of my record to be forwarded to:

Director,
Cooperative Internship Program
4615B Tolman Hall
University of California,
Berkeley, California 94720

in support of my application for admission to the CIP. Thank you.

Date:__________ Name______________________________
Family Name First Name Middle

APPLICATION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, GRADUATE DIVISION
University of California, Berkeley

Graduate Record Examination: The Graduate Record Examination is NOT required to complete the CIP application. However, if you are going to be applying for admission to a Master's program and you have not taken the examination, you may be required to do so.

Proposed Major Department: In the space provided for this entry on the application form, write "Education." If you will be concurrently enrolled in another University of California, Berkeley department, you will have to petition to add a major. If you have completed graduate work in another Department, and are applying for readmission to the Graduate Division, University of California, you will be changing your major for the quarter in which you are enrolled in Education.

Statement of Purpose: In the space provided for the applicant's statement of purpose, it is only necessary to write:

> To enter the Cooperative Internship Program for community college instructors, course work only.

Degree or Credential Desired: In this space, indicate that the Credential you seek is:

> Junior College Teaching Credential

REMINDER: TIME IS A PROBLEM! May 15, 1970 IS THE DEADLINE, SO RETURN MATERIALS AND SEND FOR TRANSCRIPTS, LETTERS AND THE LIKE AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

MATERIALS FOR OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL CAREER SERVICES
University of California, Berkeley

Ordinarily, the services of the Office of Educational Career Services are restricted to students and alumni of UCB. However, by special arrangement, these facilities are also available to persons accepted to the CIP.

The enclosed forms from that office are an important part of your CIP application. They will be sent to colleges which express an interest in you as a prospective Intern Teacher, and constitute something of an introduction of you to those colleges. Also, if you are fully accepted into the CIP (including being hired by a college as an intern), these papers will be the beginnings of a permanent placement file, available for your use as you look for new positions.

Two notes:

1. Please be sure that all materials are returned to the CIP office, not to the Office of Educational Career Services. We will make sure the forms reach the appropriate places.
2. Time is of the essence: it is important that you request reference letters as soon as possible.

The forms that make up the O.E.C.S. packet are:

1. Letters of recommendation (3)
2. Personal Data Form
3. Summary Card
4. Use of Confidential Information Statement
5. Miscellaneous: Administrative Instructions for Community College (JC) Placement Candidates, prepared as general advice by Mr. Tom Phair, Junior College Placement Advisor; map of community colleges, and directory of community college administration personnel.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE INTERNSHIP CREDENTIAL APPLICATION
California Department of Education

CIP interns are employed under the provisions of an internship credential. Before the prospective intern can be employed, the requirements for this credential must be satisfied. Note, though, that this application is not included in the application packet. It will be sent to only those candidates selected for the roster.

All applicants should know what this credential application will require. It is a California Department of Education form, and requires:

1. Fingerprint cards
2. A health examination form (completed and signed by a physician)
3. A set of official transcripts
4. Application fee of $20.00
5. Personal information, including questions related to "Professional Conduct," (facsimile reproduced from the credential application below).

---

onal Conduct. IMPORTANT—Both men and women must answer all questions by placing "X" in proper column. Any swer must be explained fully, using an extra sheet.

	Yes	No
Have you ever had a diploma, credential, or certificate, denied, revoked, or suspended?		
Have you ever failed or refused to fulfill a contract of employment entered into by you with any school district?		
Have you ever left the service of any school district without the consent of the superintendent or the governing board of such district?		
d. Have you ever been found guilty of immoral conduct or dismissed from any teaching position for immoral or unprofessional conduct or for unfitness for service?		
Have you ever been found guilty of or dismissed from any teaching position for persistent defiance of or refusal to obey the laws regulating the duties of persons serving in the public school system?		
f. Have you ever (1) forfeited bail, or been (2) arrested, or (3) convicted, or (4) fined, or (5) jailed, or (6) placed on probation for any violation of law other than minor traffic offenses? (If any of these events has occurred, this question must be answered "yes," regardless of subsequent court action under Penal Code Section 1203.4 resulting in dismissal or "expungement.")		
Have you had military service? If yes, state type of discharge: ____________ If other than honorable discharge, explain fully.		

Affidavit

(or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

this ______ day of ____________________, 19____, at City of ____________________, State of ____________

[SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT] ______________________________

Applicants having concerns or questions regarding the application for the internship credential should contact the CIP office. A copy of this application will be made available for examination upon request.

A FINAL NOTE

Full admission to the CIP involves two phases. During the first phase the applicant works primarily with the CIP office. An initial interview may be followed by a second interview. Concurrently, the applicant is asked to complete application materials. When application materials have been received, the CIP staff developes a roster of some thirty candidates from among the applicants. This roster is made known to the community colleges of Northern California. An event known as "Candidate's Introduction Day" is the chief means for introducing the rostered candidates to an assemblage of college representatives.

The second phase primarily involves the colleges themselves. Colleges invite candidates to campuses for further interviews. Interviews at the colleges will typically follow procedures and criteria customary at the college. Initiative, energy and steadfast persistence are necessary at this phase.

The CIP is the kind of program that coordinates a number of institutions and their resources, each of which, it seems, has its requirements by way of applications, forms, and the like. We recognize the burden that the applicant assumes as he gets involved in putting it together, especially with the unavoidable pressure of time. Your diligence and cooperation is necessary for the achievement of our ultimate goal...which is to facilitate the placement of outstanding instructors where they are needed.

APPENDIX C

CIP Staff Roster

APPENDIX

COOPERATIVE INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

STAFF

1970-1971

John Beverly Chairman, Ethnic Studies Department San Joaquin Delta College Stockton, California	Consultant Area Specialist
Steven A. Brown	Associate Director
Chester H. Case	Director
Phoebe Graubard	Secretary
Edward Hay Chairman, Physical Science and Math Division De Anza College Cupertino, California	Consultant Area Specialist
Donald J. Peterson Instructor, English Department City College of San Francisco San Francisco, California	Consultant Area Specialist
E. Paul Williams Director of Ethnic Studies Mills College Oakland, California	Consultant Area Specialist

APPENDIX D

List of Experienced Faculty Members, With College and Intern

EXPERIENCED FACULTY MEMBER	HOME ADDRESS	COLLEGE	CIP INTERN
Mrs. Marcia S. Aron	1052 Tevlin St. Albany, Calif. 94706	City College San Francisco	Willie Thompson
Mr. James Coleman	1000 Mandana Blvd. Oakland, Calif.		Thurban Warrick
Mr. William Dofflemeyer	430 Leslie Ave. Stockton, Calif. 95207	San Joaquin Delta	Sandra Parry
Mr. Robert Feldman	3427 Thomas Drive Palo Alto, Calif. 94305		Myrna Moran
Mr. Walter Gottlund	2212 Booth Ave. Marysville, Calif. 95901	Yuba	David Rubiales
William A. Grant	1678 Pleasant Valley Aptos, Calif. 95003	Cabrillo	Marcus Lopez
Mr. Ron Hongisto	College of Alameda 555 Atlanta Ave. Alameda, Calif. 94501	Alameda	Betty McEady
Mr. Robert C. Johnson	314 Moraga St. San Francisco, Calif. 94122	City College San Francisco	Ternot MacRenato
Lew Levinson	2014 Channing Way Berkeley, Calif. 843-6176	Laney	Gordon Keller
Mr. Fred Sims	2392 Sleepy Hollow Hayward, Calif. 94545	Chabot College	Richard Moore
Mr. James Seguin	c/o XUX Ranch Moose, Wyoming	City College San Francisco	Ani Erokwu

EXPERIENCED FACULTY MEMBER	HOME ADDRESS	COLLEGE	CIP INTERN
Dr. Irvin Roth	Foothill College 12345 El Monte Los Altos, Calif. 94022	Foothill	Oscar Martinez
Mr. Leonard Washington	2052 Jackson Court Santa Clara, Calif.	San Jose City	Ken Wesson
Mr. Robert Fricke	235 Prince St. Los Gatos, Calif. 379-8406	West Valley	Peter Thelin

APPENDIX E

Publicity Materials

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY, ANNOUNCES

a federally funded, pre-service/in-service program for the preparation of community college instructors, in cooperation with the community colleges of Northern California

1970-1971 COOPERATIVE INTERNSHIP PROGRAM FOR BEGINNING INSTRUCTORS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Purpose	to bring into community college teaching persons committed to the effective instruction of the broad range of community college students, especially "educationally disadvantaged", minority and/or low income students
Qualifications	admission to the School of Education, Graduate Division, University of California, Berkeley (for course work only)....... satisfaction of California State Internship Credential requirements... bachelor's degree .... or enrollment in a master's degree program .... or ....completed master's degree ....selection criteria of the CIP... employment criteria of the employing community college ....eligibility for federal stipends
Stipend and Salary	stipends, $75 per week for approximately one semester....salary, paid by the employing college in proportion to teaching load....combined stipend and salary will approximate a full salary
For Further Information, Contact:	Chester H. Case, Director or Steven A. Brown, Associate Director Cooperative Internship Program 5635 Tolman Hall, University of California Berkeley, California 94720 (415) 642-0740

"In selecting individuals for participation and otherwise in the administration of this program, the University of California, Berkeley, will not discriminate on the ground of race, creed, color, or national origin of any applicant or participant."

PARTICIPANTS	PHASE I Pre-Service August 17-28, 1970	PHASE II Internship First Semester	PHASE III Residency Second Semester
1. Interns	Two week pre-service Institute at Berkeley (Full time, Housing available)	Teaching 3/5 load On campus studies & development of teaching materials and methods	Teach 4/5 Continuation of studies and development
2. Master Instructors	One week pre-service Institute at Berkeley (Full time, Housing available)	Supervision of intern and collaboration in development of methods and materials	Continuing collaboration with intern
3. Interns, Master Instructors, other Faculty and Staff		On-going program of one day seminars and/or workshops on topics related to instruction, student characteristics, and other concerns.	

Cooperative Internship Program
4615B Tolman Hall
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

1970-1971

University of California
Berkeley

COOPERATIVE INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

for

BEGINNING INSTRUCTORS IN
COMMUNITY COLLEGES

funded by the Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare Title V-E, 90-3

In selecting individuals for participation and otherwise in the administration of this program, the University of California, Berkeley, will not discriminate on the ground of race, creed, color, or national origin of any applicant or participant.

ABOUT THE PROGRAM

The Cooperative Internship Program (CIP) is a pre-service/in-service program. Its primary objective is to prepare instructors for the effective teaching of the broad range of community college students. CIP is especially, but not exclusively, interested in applicants whose backgrounds and interests qualify them for teaching in challenging, innovative settings, in contact with students of minority groups, low income, and/or educationally disadvantaged backgrounds.

CIP was jointly planned by a team of community college and University of California personnel. By coordinating the resources of the cooperating community colleges, the University, and the federal government (U.S. Office of Education) the CIP will this year bring into teaching 24 new instructors. CIP's sphere of operation is northern California, primarily the larger Bay Area.

CIP stresses the concept that the reality of a substantial field experience provides a beginning instructor the setting for the best preparation. The intern teaches approximately a 70% teaching load for the academic year. Following an intensive two week pre-service institute (August 10-August 28, 1970), the intern begins teaching at the college that has employed him as an intern. Consultation, guidance and instruction is continued through the internship year, provided by the CIP staff and the staff of the employing college.

Another concept stressed by the CIP is that of maximizing flexibility and individuality for each intern's program.

PHASES OF THE CIP

The CIP extends over one academic year, in addition to the two week pre-service institute which provides an intensive introduction to the community college, curriculum development, instructional strategies, students and student characteristics.

An innovation embodied in CIP is the extensive involvement of outstanding instructors from colleges employing interns. Each intern will be teamed with an experienced faculty member in his field who will provide consultation and supervision as well as program planning and coordination.

Interns will be enrolled in the School of Education, Graduate Division for the Fall, 1970 Quarter, and will earn nine quarter units in education.

The three phases of the CIP, with their participants and activities, are depicted in the adjacent chart.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

Through the combination of stipends and partial salary paid by the employing college, the intern will receive close to a full salary. The stipends are $75 per week, and will be paid for approximately one semester, as well as for the two week pre-service institute. In addition the employing college will compensate the intern in approximate proportion to the teaching load carried.

ADMISSION TO THE C

The following qualifications must be met for admission to the CIP.

...admission for course work only to the School of Education, Graduate Division, University of California (fees required for enrollment)

...California junior college internship credential requirements (fee required for application)

...master's degree or equivalent

OR

.. bachelor's degree, and enrollment in an appropriate graduate program

...selection criteria of the CIP

...employment criteria of the employing college

...eligibility for federal stipend

(Note: To be admitted to the CIP, the applicant must be employed by a cooperating community college. The CIP will work actively to assist in the placement of applicants meeting all other requirements.)

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT:

Chester H. Case, Director, or
Steven A. Brown, Associate Director
Cooperative Internship Program
5633 Tolman Hall
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720
(415) 642-0740

APPENDIX F

Curriculum Assignment

F

CIP : 1970

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT ASSIGNMENT

During the institute, there will be discussion of curriculum, curriculum development, and related topics. Raised up for discussion, sometimes all too briefly, during the two weeks will be such topics as objectives, evaluation, grading, "standards," audio-visual (media) teaching strategies, and expectations of student performance. To bring these topics out of the realm of the abstract and into practical application (and to get a head start on the work to come, all too soon), each intern is asked to prepare a basic course outline.

A fully developed course outline is not expected. However, the course outline should encorporate several elements, as follows:

1. A statement setting out the purposes of the course
2. A "skeleton" overview of the course
3. A well developed unit, selected from some portion of the course; it should be well developed enough to teach from
4. Objectives
5. Evaluation program
6. Teaching strategies
7. A statement of policies and procedures for the class, such as grading, attendance, and the like

Ditto masters will be provided so that course outlines can be duplicated and supplied to all participants of the institute. The outlines should be ready for Friday, August 28, 1970.

APPENDIX G

Materials for Planning and the Program for a Saturday Seminar

APPENDIX G

Materials for the December 12 Meeting

NOVEMBER 24 PLANNING SESSION

TIME: Tuesday, November 24, 1:00 pm to 3:30 pm

PLACE: Mendocino Room, 5527 Tolman Hall, U.C.B.

PURPOSE: Plan Structure and Content for Dec. 12, 1970 Intern Meeting

PEOPLE:
John Beverly
Steve Brown
Chet Case
Sandy Hay
Bob Hickerson
Gordon Keller
Sandy Parry
Don Peterson
Carole Ward
Paul Williams

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS:

Drive right up to the West Gate where the guard will have your name on the "let-in" list, and park on campus. (See enclosed map for the lot with the likeliest chance of getting a place).

COMMENTS

In planning for a Saturday meeting, this problem inevitably arises; should the session be structured or unstructured? "Structured" meaning an agenda with announced topics, a theme, perhaps, and an emphasis on close analysis, information and problem solving. "Unstructured" meaning a fluid meeting, perhaps with an announced theme, but with a flexible agenda susceptible to bending with the impulse of the discussion as it takes form from the interaction of the participants. ("Unstructured" is a misnomer; there is never an absence of structure in group interaction). Each format has excellent applications and can be very productive.

To make this planning dilemma concrete, interns in the past have been divided on the question of structure vs non structured. Some interns wanted to use the session for what has been characterized as "nuts and bolts sessions" (structured) dealing with the more practical applied aspects of teaching. Others preferred the more gut-level "issues and problems" sessions (unstructured) dealing with feelings, commitments, emotions. I expect we would find a similar tendency with this year's group. So, our task will be to shape the session one way or the other, or invent a synthesis. Not an easy task, but a manageable one. Therefore, I propose that each come with some notions in respect to the following:

1) where to meet (an easy one, but remember, there has to be lunch facilities)
2) salient topics (content)
3) format (structure)
4) a viewpoint on what the session should accomplish

PROPOSAL FOR DECEMBER 12 MEETING - A TOPIC CENTERED STRUCTURED FORMAT

PROGRAM

9:00 - 9:30 Coffee; Socializing, Program Information

9:30 - 12:30 Concurrent Sessions I

	9:30 - 11:00	11:00 - 12:30
A	Behavioral Objectives	Behavioral Objectives
B	Test Construction & Evaluation	Test Construction & Evaluation
C	Video Taping & Playback	Video Taping & Playback

12:30 - 1:30 Lunch

1:30 - 4:00 Concurrent Sessions II

	1:30 - 3:00	3:00 - 4:30
A	Discussion Techniques	Discussion Techniques
B	Motivating Students	Motivating Students
C	Video Taping & Playback	Video Taping & Playback

4:30 - 5:00 Reconvene in large group: Business & Planning

Notes on the Proposal

1. With this kind of format, an individual could select four 1 1/2 hour sessions.
2. One of the CIP staff plus a co-facilitator (intern, E.F., ex-tern, or other resource person) would convene their session twice, and could then float.
3. Interns could be offered a variety of topics on a pre-session mail ballot, each voting for four topics, the six topics receiving the most votes would be planned for.
4. Once the topics have been selected, printed materials can be mailed out.
5. This format is pretty much structured

This format is offered as a starter suggestion. It can be adopted, modified or aborted. I think it has some advantages, but does leave unmet the frequently expressed need to get into a more free-form interactive session. Maybe it needs less structure? More?

What are your suggestions?

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720

December 1, 1970

Dear All:

I hope that you all had a good holiday, and that getting back to classes and students wasn't too much like returning to work...

The planning group for the next seminar (Saturday, December 12) met on Tuesday, and put together what looks to be a most interesting session. We will be meeting at my house, which is about one minute from the Eastshore Freeway in Albany, from 9:00 am until approximately 5:00 pm.

The attached map will help you find the place, and the schedule will give some idea of what concerns seem to be uppermost in interns minds at present. Also attached is a packet of thought questions, which may serve to stimulate your thinking about some specifics.

Lunch, as always, will be dutch treat. We are going to arrange in advance for some wide-choice catering, and will put that together with you first thing on the 12th. I expect it will run about $2.00 apiece.

I hope that you have already scheduled our next visit to your classes; if all goes well, we will see everyone before the 12th. At any rate, we'll see you in two weeks.

Peace.

Steve

AM

I. Motivating Students

1. What about the "careless" student?
2. What is the instructor's responsibility?
3. When the student cries "make it relevant" what is he asking?
4. Can an instructor flunk a friend?
5. How does environment affect your teaching?
6. How do you know where your students are and where they are going? Is motivation focusing on who the student is - get him to focus on who he is?

II. Test Construction

1. Levels of questions
2. Avoiding ambiguity
3. Weighting items
4. What's a passing grade

III. Discussion Techniques

1. Planning
2. What kills discussion
3. What makes them go
4. Mixed messages - divergent expectations, convergent questions

- Videotape -

- What teaching maxims have we violated or ignored? -

PM

A. Classroom Structure, How Much, What Kind?

1. Is it better to be structured or non-structured?
2. Is it true that the "structured teacher" is a better teacher?
3. Should a teacher be structured at all times and in all environments?

B. The Authoritative vs. Authoritarian Instructor

1. Which type are you?
2. Are you having problems with control of classroom dynamics?
3. Might you be an authoritarian but see yourself authoritative instructor?
4. Do you become arbitrary in dealing with challenges from students?
5. Do you elicit student comments and question but get little or none?
6. Are you able to openly admit to your students that you have made made a mistake?

PM

C. When Do You Write Off Your Students

1. Is there a point beyond which a teacher cannot be expected to go with a student?
2. What is that point - how would you go about establishing this limit for yourself?
3. How can you get a handle on what is the nature of my commitment (to teaching? to myself? to"the movement?") - what does the question mean to you?
4. Can this commitment be standardized for other teachers, given similar situations/institutions?

D. Campus Relations

1. Who do you relate to on campus? Why? (or how many people do you know on campus?)
2. Who do you have difficulty relating to on campus? Why?
3. Do you feel a part of activities on campus? Should you be? or How do you fit in on campus? Do you fit in? Where?
4. What is your role on campus? Is it too limited? Or are you spreading yourself too thin?
5. What are your priorities? Are they what you want them to be?
6. How do you relate to your students outside of the classroom?

- Motivating-

PROPOSAL FOR DECEMBER 12 MEETING - A TOPIC CENTERED STRUCTURED FORMAT

PROGRAM

9:00 - 9:30 Coffee; Socializing, Program Information

9:30 -12:00 Concurrent Sessions I

	9:30 - 10:15	10:45 - 12:00
A.	Motivating Students	
B.	Test Construction & Evaluation	
C.	Discussion Techniques	
D.	Video Taping and Playback	

12:30 - 2:00 Lunch

2:00 - 4:00 Concurrent Sessions II

	2:00 - 3:00	3:00 - 4:00
A.	Classroom Structure; How Much, What Kind?	
B.	Authoritative vs Authoritarian Instructor	
C.	When do you Write off your Students	
D.	Relating to the College	

4:00 - 5:00 Reconvene in large group for assessment & planning

APPENDIX H

Material for the Pajaro Dunes Workshop/Seminar in Faculty Development

APPENDIX H

Materials for the Pajaro Dunes Workshop
December 18, 19, 20

PAJARO DUNES WORKSHOP ON FACULTY DEVELOPMENT
December 18, 19, 20, 1970

WHY A PAJARO DUNES WORKSHOP

The Pajaro Dunes Workshop on Faculty Development is being convened and sponsored by the Cooperative Internship Program (CIP), a University of California based program, funded by the U.S.O.E. under the provisions of the Education Professions Development Act. In convening the workshop, the CIP is extending its concern for the preparation of new instructors to merge with the larger, more generalized concern of faculty development, broadly conceived.

Faculty development is to be a very large preoccupation for the community colleges of the 1970's, if the shape of emergent trends are being read accurately. Further, faculty development is going to be everybody's business, with the faculty members in the forefront. Needed will be fresh new approaches.

In working with numerous colleges, the CIP staff has become increasingly aware of the unique resource that exists in the persons of the Experienced Faculty (EF's) who have been such an integral part of the preparation of interns. It seemed most promising to engage the problem of faculty development by setting up an occasion where the EF's and others with experience and concern for faculty development could get together to first, pool their experiences, analyses, insights and visions and then, to stretch their minds in the invention of a model (or models) for development of faculty, new and experienced, that would go beyond what now exists in the name of faculty development.

WHAT IS TO BE THE OUTCOME OF THE WORKSHOP?

The specific outcome of the workshop is to be a well developed, concrete model (s) for the development of community college faculty, new and experienced. The model (s) will represent the synthesized thinking of the workshop participants. The document setting forth the model (s) will be forwarded to the U.S.O.E., and the widest possible dissemination will be sought.

WHO WILL PARTICIPATE IN THE WORKSHOP?

Participants at the workshop will come from a diversity of colleges, backgrounds, teaching areas, and experiences. Largely, the participants will have been EF's in the years 1969-70 and 1970-71. It is expected that there will be a brisk competition among viewpoints.

Everyone participating is a consultant.

Everyone participating is an expert.

(See the enclosed roster).

HOW WILL THE WORKSHOP BE ORGANIZED?

This chart depicts the time blocks and sequence of activities for the workshop:

	FRIDAY	SATURDAY	SUNDAY
AM		7:30 - 8:30: Breakfast 9:00 - 12:00: Session II-Team Session on Model Development Purpose: Analysis of Problem, Broad Outline of Model(s)	7:30 - 8:30: Breakfast 9:00 - 12:00: Session IV - Meeting of the Whole Purpose: Analysis of Model(s) Target : Synthesis, Conclusions
PM	4:30 - 5:30: Registration House #35 5:30 - 6:30: Social Occasion 6:30 - 7:30: Dinner	12:30 - 1:30: Lunch 2:00 - 5:30: Session III-Team Session on Model Development Purpose: Preparation of Written Draft of Model(s) 6:30 - 7:30: Dinner	12:30 - 1:30: Lunch ADJOURNMENT
EVE.	8:00 - 10:00: Session I - Meeting of the Whole Purpose: Overview, Definition of the Problem, Organization	OPEN	

Comments on Organization:

From the large group, three teams will be formed. Once the task of the workshop has been defined, and a general exploratory discussion has been held in Session I, the teams will go their separate ways to work by their own routes toward the common goal, which is to come up with the model (s) by the end of Session III (Saturday afternoon). The teams will not be "leaderless", inasmuch as CIP staff members will facilitate the procedings of each team. However, each team will be encouraged to devise its own strategy for achieving the stated goal.

Participant Roles:

There will be no lecturers and there will be no audiences. Participants will contribute what and when they can. Each participant is an expert, on the basis of his own experience. No one is in the role of the expert employed to lay out a preconceived master scheme. There is no hidden agenda.

Participants will be coming in from their own experiential framework. Because of the diversity among the participants, it will be useful to achieve some initial common ground by asking everyone to reflect on the following questions, which will be considered at Session I: (The list is open ended).

1. What are the needs of the new instructor?
2. Is there a "life cycle" for the experienced instructor?
3. What are the "mental health" needs of instructors?
4. How do instructors learn about learning?
5. How are instructors evaluated and on the basis of what criteria?

Participant Roles, cont.:

6. Who should/could administer a program in faculty development?
7. What does the college expect from an instructor?
8. Among new instructors, is there differential treatment accorded on the basis of sex, age, race and/or ethnicity?
9. Is the work of the instructor changing?
10. Who is involved in the hiring of the new instructor, and on the basis of what criteria?
11. Relative to other college programs, what is the priority of faculty development programs in terms of claims on the resources of the colleges?

WHAT IS MEANT BY FACULTY DEVELOPMENT?

There is no consensus as to the meaning of the term, faculty development. Some of the possible meanings are embodied in the articles enclosed here. Some of the meanings conventionally attached to the term are hopelessly archaic, such as the "course work= credential=preparation" concept, or the "opening of school institute" concept.

It would seem, though, that faculty development must be construed broadly, as it has to do with nothing less than the growth of an individual and his multiple functions as an instructor, a scholar, a counselor, and certainly, as a human being. A faculty development program must be multi-faceted, because people are thus. A faculty development program must be a long range program, because people and their jobs change.

WHAT SHOULD A MODEL INCLUDE?

The general rule is that a model, when written out, should be readily comprehensible to a person reasonably knowledgeable in the field, but who has had no part in its writing. To achieve this kind of comprehensibility, a model might include:

1. Statement of objectives
2. A preamble, or prologue
3. A schematic, flow chart, or some variety of graphic showing the phases, sequences, and their relationships
4. Policy statements
5. Process statements
6. Estimates of costs in time, money, personnel
7. Assessment procedures
8. Evaluation procedures
9. Role definitions
10. Organizational basis, eg., in-house, intra-district, consortium, "institute"
11. Rationale, or theoretical foundations

Constraints:

In developing the model, the following should be kept in mind:

1. The model should be exportable
2. The model should be comprehensive
3. The model should be realistic and unrealistic at the same time, that is, it should bear the prospects for practical success, yet it should not be unduly compromised by the specific obstacles potent in the present, but susceptible to change.

Cooperative Internship Program
Pajaro Dunes Weekend
December 18-20, 1970

ROSTER

NAME	COLLEGE	COLLEGE ADDRESS
Mrs. Marcia Aron	City College San Francisco	50 Phelan Ave. San Francisco, Ca. 94112
John Beverly	Laney College	1001 3rd Ave. Oakland, Ca. 94606
Steven A. Brown	Univ. of California, Berkeley	5633 Tolman Hall Berkeley, Ca. 94720
Henry Bryant	Laney College	1001 3rd Ave. Oakland, Ca. 94606
Charles Brydon	Univ. of California, Berkeley	4615 Tolman Hall Berkeley, Calif. 94720
Chester Case	Univ. of California, Berkeley	5633 Tolman Hall Berkeley, Ca. 94720
James Coleman	Laney College	1001 3rd Ave. Oakland, Ca. 94606
Charles Collins	Univ. of California, Berkeley	4623 Tolman Hall Berkeley, Ca. 94720
Ernest Crutchfield	Laney College	1001 3rd Ave. Oakland, Ca. 94720
George Dabney	De Anza College	21250 Stevens Creek Blvd. Cupertino, Ca. 95014
John Dumitru	Foothill College	12345 El Monte Rd. Los Altos Hills, Ca. 94022
Robert Fellman	Foothill College	12345 El Monte Rd. Los Altos Hills, Ca. 94022

ROSTER

NAME	COLLEGE	COLLEGE ADDRESS
Robert Fricke	West Valley College	44 East Latimer Ave. Campbell, Ca. 95008
Michael Furay	Laney College	1001 3rd Ave. Oakland, Ca. 94606
Leon Ginsberg	Laney College	1001 3rd Ave. Oakland, Ca. 94606
Walter Gottlund	Yuba College	Beale Rd. at Linda Ave. Marysville, Ca. 95901
Mrs. Carol Johnson	Diablo Valley College	321 Golf Club Rd. Pleasant Hill, Ca. 94523
Robert C. Johnson	City College San Francisco	50 Phelan Ave. San Francisco, Ca. 94112
John Lee	Laney College	1001 3rd Ave. Oakland, Ca. 94606
Lew Levinson	Laney College	1001 3rd Ave. Oakland, Ca. 94606
Neil McCallum	Ohlone College	650 Washington Blvd. Fremont, Ca. 94537
Raymond Oliva	Sierra College	5000 Rocklin Road Rocklin, Ca. 95677
Joe Patrick	Diablo Valley College	321 Golf Club Rd. Pleasant Hill, Ca. 94523
Irvin Roth	Foothill College	12345 El Monte Rd. Los Altos Hills, Ca. 94022
William Schoon	City College San Francisco	50 Phelan Ave. San Francisco, Ca. 94122

Cooperative Internship Program
Pajaro Dunes Weekend
December 18-20, 1970

ROSTER

NAME	COLLEGE	COLLEGE ADDRESS
Harold Seger	Univ. of California, Berkeley	4615 Tolman Hall Berkeley, Ca. 94720
James Seguin	City College San Francisco	50 Phelan Ave. San Francisco, Ca. 94112
Fred Sims	Chabot College	25555 Hesperian Blvd. Hayward, Ca. 94545
William Snyder	Laney College	1001 3rd Ave. Oakland, Ca. 94606
Dale Tillery	Univ. of California, Berkeley	4621 Tolman Hall Berkeley, Ca. 94720
Peter Varcados	Cabrillo College	6500 Soquel Dr. Aptos, Ca. 95003
Leonard Washington	San Jose City College	2100 Moorpark Ave. San Jose, Ca. 95114
Paul Williams	Chabot College	25555 Hesperian Blvd. Hayward, Ca. 94545
John Carhart	Contra Costa J.C. District	1005 Escobar Street Martinez, Ca. 94553

COOPERATIVE INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

STAFF

1970-1971

John Beverly Chairman, Ethnic Studies Department San Joaquin Delta College Stockton, California	Consultant Area Specialist
Steven A. Brown	Associate Director
Chester H. Case	Director
Phoebe Graubard	Secretary
Edward Hay Chairman, Physical Science and Math Division De Anza College Cupertino, California	Consultant Area Specialist
Donald J. Peterson Instructor, English Department City College of San Francisco San Francisco, California	Consultant Area Specialist
E. Paul Williams Director of Ethnic Studies Mills College Oakland, California	Consultant Area Specialist

APPENDIX D

Notes Toward a Model for Programs in Faculty Development

I

NOTES TOWARD A MODEL FOR PROGRAMS IN FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Generalizations:

1. All teachers are new teachers

2. Important aspects of teaching can be learned

3. Significant ingredients in the process by which a person learns to be a faculty member are socialization and acculturation. These processes can be put to the service of faculty development, or can inhibit the development of desired competencies and attitudes

4. Each individual relates to the processes of professionalization from his own frame of reference

5. Faculty, in some organizational form, should be in charge of the developmental program, direct it and evaluate it

6. Shared experience, as in small group settings, can increase self-awareness and contribute to the learning process

7. Resources do exist and can be organized in a manner that maximizes faculty development programs.

Possible Ingredients (in no particular order)

1. Faculty to faculty colloquia; faculty offer courses for faculty, of variable length, on variable topics

2. Simultaneous clusters: "teams" of instructors rotating in a cluster of courses, working together

3. Administrators and instructors rotate in and out of administrative roles on a regular basis

4. Released (euphemism: assigned time) time for focus on curriculum development

5. Projects to develop faculty sensitivity to students, their characteristics and needs

6. Sub-group programs, e.g., departmental. Pairing of instructors, new and old, review of policies, regular meetings, some unstructured

7. Seminar-retreats of students, faculty; assign individual instructors to groups of students for long-term association

8. Use sabbatical vacancies as floating FTE's reserved for interns

9. Regular faculty hours, unstructured

10. Video taping of class sessions

11. Departmental open house

12. A month of per-service activities, with pay

13. Workshops, clinics

14. Management of the initial assignments of new instructors to reduce load and relieve overburdening with classes difficult to teach

Problems? Issues?

1. Likely, many faculty members will resist development programs when the programs infringe on settled routines, are arbitrarily imposed, lack discernable purpose and application, and are perceived as threatening.

2. Development programs should take place in a setting of educational reality. Some aspects of the program should be reserved for peer-group interaction, but students, teaching and learning, should be very much involved

3. It is not known how the process of "becoming deadwood" happens, but it does occur.

4. Any program should (must) receive support from the administration and faculty decision makers in the form of resources and political support.

5. The professional school concept is important, and it is useful to have a "third party" involved in faculty development (e.g., a person in a role relationship with the program participant which is not an authority, hiring-firing relationship), but the program should first and foremost be a college effort

II

NOTES TOWARD A MODEL FOR PROGRAMS IN FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

What should a community college be?

A community college must identify community needs, first, before it considers its allegiance to transfer programs, etc. The resultant analysis should determine the characteristics of the new faculty members to be sought. It is clear that there is such a wide variety of communities that no one model of a college can suffice.

The community college must be a change agent and offer something for all segments of the community.

Vocational education, for example, will have to respond to rapid changes in the community; educational programs should be designed to train students for broadly ranging abilities in basic skills, problem solving, and adaptability. Vocational education should be a vehicle for learning, rather than an end in itself.

It is essential that colleges recognize that learning takes place in widely different situations and life styles.

Faculty members needed to staff such an institution:

Faculty members must accept direction derived from community needs and be committed to the philosophy of the college. Although the college expects faculty applicants to be competent in their academic discipline, the faculty member's concern for and sensitivity to students is of higher priority.

New instructors are to be selected on the basis of their past performance and enthusiasm for working with students in an environment where there is a committment to change as necessitated by the changing needs identified in the community. These instructors must have verbalized and demonstrated their commitment to accept students where they are and help them further their objectives. This "contract" derives primarily from the students' needs. Students are to be "moved" from where they are toward where they are going. The new instructors should be willing to participate in honest self-evaluation and critical evaluation from students and colleagues. The new instructor is eager to accept and participate in the challenge inherent in an institution committed to change and to creating new programs as the need is evidenced in the community.

Orientation programs for new faculty

The following disparate suggestions emerged from the group:

1. Orientation programs are best delayed until after the classroom experience has begun and some sense of relevancy has developed. Faculty acceptance, however, may well be augmented by an unstructured weekend between new faculty and a mixture of experienced faculty and administrators and students.

2. The traditional academic instructor must have contact with satellite groups committed to the primary philosophy previously elaborated. The honest evaluations of students, faculty and administrators can elicit this recognition of need for revitalizing experienced faculty. If the traditional academician is not amenable to change, the least that must be achieved is to make students aware of this before or soon after matriculating in the community college.

3. New faculty should meet with select groups of established faculty in an invitational off-campus group experience before the beginning of regular classes.

4. Regardless of background or past teaching experience, new faculty should be involved in an orientation program that incorporates an "experienced faculty" member and a regular program of meetings to discuss teaching experience, students, curriculum, etc.

5. Community involvement should be on as graphic a level as possible, e.g., being given released time to "discover" the community.

6. Training should include teacher introduction to all aspects of the immediate community: for example, labor unions, the poor, minority groups, business, local high schools, neighborhoods, etc.

7. The new faculty member should have an understanding of the particular college's philosophy--not what is in the catalogue, but what the reality of the the school is about.

8. The new faculty needs someone to turn to for help (a buddy or a monthly meeting to discuss problems, new situations, etc.)

9. There should be participation in an annual faculty meeting.

Experienced faculty:

1. A program of regularized change must be built into the collegiate system--e.g., no faculty member should teach a particular

course more than three times. Teachers should be encouraged to develop cross disciplinary lines.

2. Evaluation by faculty teams should be explored for improvement of instruction, not for administrative assessment. Student evaluation of faculty should also be encouraged.

3. Faculty should be urged to take courses from other colleagues in disciplines outside their own particular field.

4. The "cluster college" concept should be explored by faculty as a device to encourage reorganization.

5. Periodic faculty forums should be encouraged to discuss new methods of instruction, research and development.

The life cycle of the faculty member

A. Exhuberant insecurity

B. Consolidation

C. Plateau of stability

D. Decadent maturation

A QUIET INSTITUTION IS A dead INSTITUTION

APPENDIX I

John C. Fiedler, Evaluation of the 1969 Pre-Service Institute, CIP

Evaluation of the 1969 Pre-Service Institute for Beginning Instructors in Community Colleges, Conducted by the Cooperative Internship Program, University of California, Berkeley

John C. Fiedler, Evaluator

November, 1969

149

Evaluation of the 1969 Pre-Service Institute for Beginning Instructors in Community Colleges, Conducted by the Cooperative Internship Program, University of California, Berkeley

Introduction

This is an evaluation of the pre-service institute conducted August 18-29, 1969, as part of the Cooperative Internship Program for New Community College Instructors at the University of California, Berkeley. CIP is a combined pre-service/in-service program for the preparation of new instructors. Designed to provide teacher training and in-depth exposure to the community college scene for two weeks prior to the beginning of the fall term, and then teacher development during the academic year, this program is funded under provisions of Title V-E, Education Professions Development Act (P.L. 90-35).

Up to twenty-five interns are selected for the program each year, selection requiring the following minimum requirements to be met: admission to the Graduate Division and the School of Education at the University; eligibility for a California state junior college internship credential; possession of a master's degree or equivalent; or possession of a bachelor's degree; enrollment in a graduate program with the expectation of completing a master's degree by the end of the internship program; having passed screening and application criteria of the CIP; meeting employment requirements of cooperating community colleges; becoming employed by a community college; and being eligible for a federal stipend.

Employed for a three-fifths teaching load during the first semester, the interns receive an additional $75 per week stipend as participants in the program. During the second semester, their teaching assignments are increased to four-fifths. Their financial support then comes entirely from the employing institution.

One important element of the program is that new interns are teamed with master instructors (also called "experienced faculty members") from the employing institutions. Beginning the second week of the pre-service institute, this relationship is designed to last the entire year, the experienced faculty members providing consultation and supervision as well as program planning and coordination.

This program was jointly planned by experts in teacher training and community college education from the University of California and a team of representatives from community colleges in northern California. One of its purposes is to serve certain critical employment needs of community colleges in the northern area of the state. Of particular concern to the planners also is the education of "educationally disadvantaged" students.

Research Procedures for this Report

The data for evaluation were gathered through a program of interviewing the interns, each interview lasting approximately one hour. Interviewing took place at the college of the intern's employment and included the following schools:

Cabrillo College
Chabot College
City College of San Francisco
College of San Mateo
Contra Costa College
De Anza College
Diablo Valley College
Foothill College
Hartnell College
Laney College
Monterey Peninsula College
Napa College
Ohlone College
San Jose City College
Sierra College
West Valley College

Twenty-one of the twenty-four interns enrolled in the program were contacted during a total of seven days of interviewing (September 24, September 30 - October 2, October 6-8). The interview sessions were tape recorded, and have subsequently been transcribed for purposes of analysis.

Prior to the evaluation tour, two days of meetings were held for members of the CIP team and the evaluator. During these meetings, members of the team and the evaluator discussed the purposes of the evaluation, began to develop questions of interest, suggested interview protocols, and developed a plan of operation. Based upon suggestions made by the staff, the interviewer further refined the questions to be used. The questions used during the interview are the following:

Goals

1. Could you tell me what were the goals of the CIP two-week institute?
2. Do you think these goals were attained? Why?
3. What revisions would you suggest in the program to better achieve its goals?

Structure

4. Was the institute long enough to accomplish its purpose? What suggestions do you have about the length?

5. What about the way the two weeks were organized? Were they too structured or perhaps not structured enough?

6. If the institute had been planned as a retreat where everyone lived in, would it have been more effective?

Current Use of Time

7. From what I understand, you are carrying a three-fifths teaching load. What kinds of things are you doing with your time as an intern?

Master Teacher

8. Has your relationship with your master teacher been a helpful one for you?

9. For our guidance in the future, what kinds of qualities do you think we should look for in a master teacher?

Group Interaction

10. Would you describe for me your impressions of the relationship of the participants to each other during the two weeks?

11. Do you think the group's interaction could have been better than it was?

Video Taping

12. Was the use of video tape in developing teaching styles helpful to you? How?

13. What changes should be made to make it more effective than it was?

Staff Members

14. Would you say that the staff members provided you with sufficient help during the two-week institute?

15. Did they provide a balanced point of view?

Resource People

16. Did you benefit from listening to the two experts from the junior college field discussing their specialties?

17. Should more have been included? What types?

Open-Ended

18. What do you remember uppermost about the two-week institute?

19. Do you think attending the institute has really helped prepare you for teaching at a junior college? In what ways?

20. Have some of your ideas about teaching been changed by the institute? How?

21. What difficulties are you facing in teaching that you were not prepared for during the institute?

Certain responses suggested additional questions which needed to be asked. And, although responses to questions occasionally wandered from the subject, the interns were allowed to develop the thoughts important to them at that particular moment. As a result, the evaluation occasionally yielded important data not originally anticipated. Nevertheless, the evaluator attempted to gain specific responses to each of the interview questions listed.

It is important to note that this evaluation project provided both an opportunity to gather information regarding the two-week institute and an opportunity to see the interns functioning in a professional setting.

An Impression of the Interns

All interns who were visited appeared willing to cooperate in the evaluation procedure, and their responses seemed to be both candid and thoughtful.

I. For purposes of brevity their background and certain characteristics will be outlined.

A. Age range: from early twenties to mid-thirties

B. Racial and ethnic make-up:

4 - Americans of Latin descent
10 - blacks (2 Africans)
7 - whites
21 Total

C. Teaching areas:

1 - Art
2 - Guidance, Counseling, College Readiness Program
9 - Ethnic Studies (e.g., Black Literature, Mexican-American History, Psychology of Ethnic Minorities, Afro-American History, African Civilization)
3 - Experimental College (includes Counseling)
3 - Mathematics and Science
3 - Social Science (e.g., U. S. History, Government, Sociology)
21 Total

D. Educational background:

The interns range from having just received the bachelor's degree to having completed the master's degree.

E. Previous teaching experience:

Most interns have not taught previously. Those who have taught have either elementary or secondary school experience, or have tutored and counseled in various inner-city projects. A couple have just completed schooling and have no work experience, except as graduate assistants while attending school.

II. Observable personality characteristics:

The interns appeared to be similar in a number of observable characteristics: most were open, approachable, intelligent, patient, friendly, emotional, and seemed to exude an air of youthfulness and vitality.

III. Instructor-institutional "fit":

With perhaps two exceptions, most seem to be adjusting to their new roles satisfactorily, are being accepted by their colleagues, and are being actively sought out by their students. In the two exceptions, both feel their colleagues are aloof and seem unwilling to be helpful. As a result, they feel isolated, lonely, and admit to being dependent upon emotional and professional support from members of the CIP staff. One is Mexican-American; the other is from England. Neither, by the way, is being avoided by his students.

In another instance, although the faculty is warm and friendly, some members have demonstrated what are described as racist attitudes, upsetting and offending the new faculty member. This person has also encountered problems in renting an apartment because of her race.

IV. Attitude toward teaching:

Almost uniformly, the interns seem eager, strongly motivated to do a good job of teaching, and dedicated to the concept that the teacher can be an agent of change (this latter concept being particularly noticeable in conversations with a number of interns).

Many are using innovative approaches to teaching; one, for example, uses a tape recorder to make comments to students regarding their theme papers; and another is using role-playing in class to dramatize the emotional impact of slave trading upon the black man (whites taking the part of slaves and blacks taking the part of slaveowners). These interns feel the institute gave them the courage to try new methods. In addition, the interns seem strongly concerned with the impact of their teaching, continually questioning their objectives, evaluating the questions they ask in class, carefully examining their test questions for the type of learning they wish to measure.

Those who were interviewed seem to believe in the philosophical concepts underlying the community college movement and generally tend to accept their respective roles within this movement.

The interns generally believe that a good instructor must also be a counselor, and seem to be putting this belief into practice. Many of them convey a sense of total immersion in their new jobs

> and find it disheartening to find that senior faculty members often do not possess the same degree of dedication they hold.

The Interns Evaluate CIP

I. The Goals of the Program.

The interns appeared to understand the nature of the goals of the pre-service institute. However, each one perceived them in moderately different ways, some focusing more specifically upon one more than upon another. For example, one viewed them in this context: "The idea was to instill a philosophy, an attitude toward teaching, not so much programming, content, or even form, but an attitude of mind. It was to make us more aware of the needs of the students and the relevance of the materials we were going to teach." Another stated, "The goals were to prepare an individual in the shortest amount of time for the task of teaching, . . . to acquaint the individual with the concept of the community college . . . and to acquaint the interns with the general problems of teaching and student problems." While another's comments seemed to agree with those already quoted, he indicated that learning about the techniques of teaching was a very important goal for him.

Perhaps the most comprehensive statement of the goals made by any of the interns is the following:

> One of the goals was to acquaint us with the operations of the junior college, and to prepare

> us to become junior college instructors; in other words, I think that they were trying to advance us so that when we walked into the classroom, we wouldn't necessarily have the experience of a first-day teacher. We might be two or three years or quarters or semesters ahead of our time. Another major goal . . . was working with disadvantaged students; these are either minority [students] or those having problems in their own fields and in basics: mathematics, English, whatever.

Another intern made the observation that the institute became a vehicle for "sharing our new ideas . . . without being lectured to . . . and without listening to stuffy educational bromides."

To summarize and review the comments of the interns, the goals seemed to be:

A. To acquaint new instructors with the philosophy and goals of the community college movement along with the characteristics of community college students;

B. to expose new instructors to the methodology of teaching junior college students in a variety of disciplines;

C. to prepare new teachers from cultural and racial minorities for teaching careers in schools having large populations of Third World students.

Most interns thought that the goals of CIP were accomplished to a large extent, but some suggested that these goals may have been too diverse for a two-week session. These individuals commented that each goal required a minimum of two weeks of group work to be more fully accomplished. For example, some felt they needed additional time discussing topics such as testing and grading; some blacks felt that too much time was devoted to discussing topics of concern to the white population; and some whites objected to the amount of time spent discussing minority group problems.

The following are examples of the range of comments made regarding the accomplishment of CIP goals:

> I found a progression from the two weeks internship to the teaching here. I found that emotionally I was prepared for the students.
>
> All of (ghe goals) couldn't have been reached in two weeks. Some of the goals we went into and we covered pretty thoroughly. . . .Others were sort of put to the side; we mentioned them, and then we wouldn't go into them.
>
> I think. . .the goals of giving us some "nuts-and bolts" things could have been more fully attained for me. I've used all the "nuts-and-bolts" things, that I wouldn't have been "hip" to the fact that they existed at all before.
>
> Judging from myself, walking into the classroom the first day was a lot easier from being in this program and (learning) some of the techniques involved in the program.
>
> Many of the people (at the institute) were from minority groups in our society. And what was presented to us was primarily concerned with the majority, the white world.
>
> Many of the things (discussed), of course, were more relevant to someone teaching at City College, or Laney, or places like that, rather than the homogenous clientele we have at this school.

It is difficult to judge whether or not the goals of the institute are, in fact, too diverse. Certainly, the interns themselves represent a variety of characteristics and interests. Yet, almost all of them seemed to have benefited from the two-week exposure. Perhaps enough was accomplished just to begin making them think about teaching in their respective new settings. Or perhaps the primary goal of the institute should be more clearly articulated by the staff. Also, in order to exploit "unity among diversity," small-group discussions might be structured around these topics each day: (1) The Educational Problems of Third World Students; (2) Media and Methods for the Beginning Teacher; (3) Problems of Implementation of Educational Objectives.

Regarding revisions to better accomplish the goals of the institute, the interns had numerous, sometimes conflicting, suggestions. Some examples are the following:

(1) Provide more video-taping.
(2) Provide less video-taping.
(3) Continue the institute for an extra week.
(4) Devote more time to each individual's subject matter specialty.
(5) Revise the presentations on curriculum planning; they are much too cluttered with jargon.
(6) Eliminate the requirement that the interns develop course outlines for their subjects; that assignment is not a useful one.
(7) Concentrate more heavily on developing each individual's course outline.
(8) Provide field work experiences, perhaps allowing the interns to observe classes at a junior college.
(9) Spend less time discussing budgets and junior college structure; these subjects are a bit too abstract for a new intern to be concerned with at the outset.
(10) Eliminate the experienced faculty during the two-week institute.
(11) Make the experienced faculty participate in the entire two-week institute, rather than participating for the second week only.

II. The Structure.

Most interns felt that two weeks was an appropriate length for the institute. Many were intrigued with the idea of making the institute a retreat.

Almost all felt the program was evenly balanced between too much structure and not enough. One comment heard often was that everyone was aware of the general direction in which the group was moving, but that individuals felt free to alter it from time to time to pursue relevant issues as they arose.

Some felt that attendance responsibilities of the interns should have been clearly established before the institute started.

III. The Staff.

The interns considered the staff to be helpful, approachable, and appropriate models to emulate. One intern pointed out that one of the real strengths of the program was the ability, insight, and helpfulness of the staff members. They were available when help was needed, they were aware of the problems new teachers would confront, and they were all experts in their respective fields.

Moreover, the interns felt the staff represented an ideal balance of teaching backgrounds and philosophies. As one intern observed, "They disagreed, and they did not hesitate to show their disagreement . . . ; [we saw that] there's never one approach." Another intern commented:

> I think Sandy (Hay) represented one point of view. . . . Certainly, John Beverly represented an opposite point of view. They [i.e., points of view] were all represented. You have Sandy, who is much more structured and relies much more on what I call "tried and proved" teaching techniques, which certainly are valid when used properly, just as John Beverly's techniques certainly are valid, depending on the personality and the way the techniques are used. I think they both had something to offer. My personal philosophy is that I fall between the two. I'm probably not as loose as John Beverly, and I'm not as tightly structured as Sandy. I'd fall in the middle. . .using them as extremes.

As seen from the perspective of still another intern, the balance in point of view provided some of the excitement and stimulation of the two weeks.

> Paul Williams [was] on one side and John Beverly on the other; the others fell in between. There was really a balance there; and there never was a real consensus between Paul and John, which was because they both had really valid points of view, but they were different. Sandy came off as the intellectual. To go from one to another--as Sandy did, to set off John, set this one off, etc.-- was really great. But I don't think [the institute] would have been very meaningful had people like Paul or John not been invited. They were very, very stimulating in this seminar.

A few interns expressed concern that the leadership provided by the staff members fluctuated whenever any of them was missing. Said one intern, "They [i.e., the staff] were not all there at all times, and I think if they expect us to be there, they should be there, too."

Their feelings toward the director of the program were unanimous: he is an able and flexible leader, knows educational theory, is committed to a developmental philosophy of education, is helpful, and is also willing to listen to and try to understand points of view which differ from his own. One intern commented that he was always around and always busy. Said another:

> I think Chet Case provided excellent leadership. And I liked him. He really knew the educational business; he knew all the jargon; he knew all the theories; he could work with them. But he thought like us, and felt like us; he could bridge the gap.

IV. Video Taping.

Reaction to the use of video tape was mixed. Some interns felt that it helped them develop effective teaching styles. Some were not so sure about its usefulness. And one expressed an aversion to seeing himself on video tape, claiming it was a shocking experience; however, he said he profited from criticisms of his "mini-lessons" made by his fellow interns.

In discussing the use of video taping with the interns, the evaluator received the impression that the greatest weakness in use of this medium was lack of uniformity in conducting the tape sessions. There were a couple of interns who never had an opportunity to present a lesson to be taped. And there were a number who had taped only one lesson. On the other extreme, one individual presented four lessons and was beginning to feel bored with the whole thing.

Some felt the taping sessions seemed artificial without students present and with the length of presentation limited. However, most interns expressed some satisfaction with the video taping. Those who were enthusiastic suggested they needed additional taping sessions during the two weeks, and would have liked to present a lesson for a longer interval of time. The following comment is typical of those uttered by interns who liked video taping:

> About one of the most beautiful things about [the two weeks] was the video taping. That was something. I don't know if it was planned thoroughly all the time. But we started using it more and more as the time went on, because we realized it was such a great instrument. And I don't know why it hasn't been used a heck of a lot more before.

V. Group Interaction.

The interns generally felt they established an unusual degree of rapport with each other and with the staff during the first week, this rapport allowing for an openness and for an exciting exchange of points of view.

A few, however, felt that white interns were somewhat inhibited by the presence of minority group members. As one said, "The minority group people got along pretty well, but I thought there might have been a little better [interaction] between the minorities and the whites. The whites were hesitant to talk, because they were scared that they would offend somebody."

And one felt concerned about the racial and ethnic composition of the interns:

> What I didn't like was that there weren't enough Mexicans at the institute. There were three Mexicans and one Spaniard. There were more blacks than there were Mexicans. Now the Mexican population, they need teachers too, just as much as the blacks do. This area [where I teach] especially; [this community] needs Mexican teachers, and that's my big gripe--not enough Mexicans, just three of them. There were more whites than there were Mexicans.

According to most of the interns, the second week did not match the first one, the presence of the experienced faculty hindering group cohesiveness. One intern put it this way: "The first week of the institute . . . was more successful than the second week. The experienced faculty came in the second week, and we kind of lost the atmosphere we had before."

VI. Experienced Faculty.

Their presence during the second week tended to undo some of the gains of the first week.

A few experienced faculty members seem to be operating superbly in helping their interns become acclimated to their new roles and to their new surroundings. However, many seem to be doing little to help their interns, partially because they have overcommitted their own professional time, partially because they have different teaching interests, and partially because of differences of personality, values, and age between the interns and the experienced faculty.

The following reaction to the experienced faculty is typical of the feelings of some of the interns:

> I know most of the interns were quite disappointed with the second week; most of them were quite happy with the first week. And I don't see what the master teachers did. In a sense they just brought in a stifling 'this is just another education course' deal. And they brought in the authority, the authoritarian role . . . . I think more than anything it forced the interns into a role of [pretending to be] tolerant. We just let them make their speeches and play their roles, and we just sort of shut up ourselves.

Another intern, equally dissatisfied with the effect of their presence, concluded that it "was a big mistake not selecting the experienced faculty members more carefully."

A few interns have had exceptionally good rapport with their experienced faculty members, having found them to be especially helpful and supportive. One intern, for example, describes his experienced faculty member in the following way:

> We've gotten along very well. He's made suggestions, and has helped me any time I wanted it. He's encouraged me in a lot of senses. And he's always offering help, just in the sense that if I need it I can come to him for things. And I really feel that it's just not the 'partner on your team' sort of thing, but he's turning out to be a fairly good friend now.

Another describes a similar relationship with his experienced faculty member:

> During the two-week institute our own relationship was quite good; . . . he tried to tell me, since he was familiar with this college, more about [it]; and since he knew the courses I was teaching, [since] he had taught them before, I saw his old exams and outlines and things like that. That was

> helpful . . . . He comes in and visits me every day and sees how I'm getting along, and I try and consult him on different problems. He looks at my student enrollment; and if he recognizes any student in a class that he'd talked with before, he tries to tell me something about the student.
>
> He's been very helpful.

The experienced faculty member can provide an important service in helping a new intern develop to be a capable and competent professional. Ways must be sought to improve the worth of his contribution. Perhaps experienced faculty should participate in the entire two-week institute, and perhaps younger, innovative, non-authoritarian individuals can be recruited.

VII. Resource People.

Dale Tillery's presentation was very well received. Many interns expressed pleasure with the clarity of his statistics and charts. Many also expressed a desire to hear from him again.

Charles Brydon's presentation was of some interest to all, but seemed to have particular appeal to those whose interests are administrative in nature.

Many interns expressed an interest in having students and community leaders also invited to be resource people.

VIII. Other Comments, Criticisms, Observations.

A few black interns suggested that if the program truly attempts to minister to the needs of minority faculty members in urban settings, it needs a more authentic black perspective.

They feel this perspective can only be achieved by a black person performing the role of director or assistant director of CIP.

One or two interns suggested that utilization of small groups be modified to allow women to get together and talk about their forthcoming teaching assignments. Also, one indicated that blacks, browns, and whites might profit meeting separately in small groups.

Some felt the time spent developing course outlines was wasted; others are using them faithfully as the outlines for the classes they are presently teaching. Some felt the material covered during the two weeks was too general; some took the opposite point of view. The interns seemed to be evenly divided regarding teaching methodology and use of media: some felt it was overly emphasized; others wanted more than they received, especially in the areas of testing and grading. A goodly number profited from discussions relating to cognitive and affective domains of learning. They felt more time could have been devoted to these topics.

Perhaps an expert in media could be used as a resource person for an afternoon session. Meeting in small groups, the interns could then have an opportunity to ask the expert questions regarding use of media in their specific teaching areas.

Major Impressions of Evaluator

I. A Sense of Dedication.

Particularly impressive was the interns' overall sense of dedication, of belief in the community college movement, and genuine desire to do a good job of teaching. As a group, they seemed aware that they had a special commitment to the goals of the program. As one said,

> I think the whole group seemed committed . . . to the program; [I saw this] especially during the short meetings that we had in small groups, the kinds of questions that were asked, the kinds of answers that were given, the participation. All these things indicated to me that members of the internship were committed and concerned for the program.

Another intern pointed out that the program had done much to instill a philosophy, to develop a collective attitude toward teaching in the community college.

II. Current Use of Time.

What do interns do with time when it is made available? They take classes to finish degrees, they counsel students, they meet with community leaders, they advise clubs, they get maneuvered into teaching additional courses, they develop curricula for new courses, they attend meetings, and they prepare lessons for the courses they are teaching. Most of them seem to be overextended in their professional commitments despite the fact they are being paid for a three-fifths teaching load.

III. Institutional Acceptance.

For the most part, the colleges where the interns teach are accepting them and rapidly involving them in the business of the academic community. Where the match between intern and experienced faculty has been good, a relationship is developing which should prove beneficial for the professional growth of the intern. Where the match has not worked well, some interns have sought the advice and help of other colleagues in their disciplines. In a few cases, interns have not felt encouraged to seek out their colleagues; these interns feel isolated, somewhat perplexed, and seem strongly dependent upon the staff of CIP for professional support. One particular individual made the following comment: "I think the internship people should intervene a little more directly into the working life of the intern while he's teaching. I feel cut off now from Berkeley. I'd like to feel I'm still working with Chet Case." An individual's growth and development as a new teacher seem to be strongly dependent upon the degree to which colleagues accept and encourage him. Lacking support, a new teacher may miss an important phase in his own training.

IV. A Need: Revised Selection Criteria for Experienced Faculty Members.

CIP staff members need to evaluate carefully the potential contributions of experienced faculty members who are to be chosen for work in the program. Experienced faculty members volunteering for CIP need sufficient time to allow them to be available to help their interns. Having too many other commitments, some experienced faculty members are not sufficiently free to be much help. In addition, faculty members who volunteer for CIP should be screened for characteristics which compliment those of the interns. And only those should be chosen who appear strongly committed to helping interns make the transition to full professional status.

V. CIP - The Bridging Mechanism.

CIP seems to have acted as a bridging mechanism for interns who lack the paper qualifications to teach and for institutions who urgently need the special talents and competencies of the interns in the program. Without CIP, these interns might not be teaching this year, and without CIP some of the sixteen institutions might not have implemented and developed many of the special new teaching projects currently under operation.

VI. Need for Further Study.

Since this evaluation study was conducted shortly after the start of the fall semester, no information was available regarding the effectiveness of the CIP in serving on-the-job needs of interns at their colleges. It would be interesting to know what problems are being encountered by the staff in coordinating the continued training of each intern. Also, data should be gathered regarding the degree of professional growth of each intern during his first year. Additional questions of interest are the following: What new problems are being encountered by interns at their schools? Do they feel they are receiving adequate training and support in the field from the staff of CIP? How satisfied are the participating institutions with the interns? Will the interns retain their initial sense of dedication to teaching and to the community college movement? Do students learn more readily from interns who have undergone special training as compared to new instructors who have no special training? If a thorough appraisal of CIP is to be made, CIP should gather additional data in some of the areas which have been mentioned. The staff should therefore attempt to extend its program of evaluation to cover the latter part of the internship period.

VII. A Brief Note on Research Methodology.

The findings in this report are based upon a field study of interns involving an interview of approximately one hour per person. Since certain control limitations exist to this type of research, the results should be considered tentative. It is suggested that the evaluation procedure be replicated at some later date to verify and strengthen the evidence treated in this report.

John C. Fiedler,
Evaluator

APPENDIX J

Evaluation Instruments: Student, Dean, EF

INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

To The Student:

Your responses to the following questions will be very useful feedback for your instructor and for evaluating the internship program in which your instructor has been a participant.

In responding, please think of your instructor in comparison with the other instructors you have had. Do not compare your instructor to any specific instructor, but to "instructors in general."

Thank you.

Name of the Instructor: ______________________________ (1-21)

Title of the Course: ______________________________

This instructor, compared to "instructors in general",...	1 much less	2 less	3 about the same	4 more	5 much more
(22) ...is able to make the subject interesting					
(23) ...tries a variety of teaching techniques					
(24) ...respects students					
(25) ...is approachable by students					
(26) ...understands the problems of students					
(27) ...is well informed on community problems and issues					
(28) ...grades fairly on a reasonable standard					
(29) ...is flexible and open minded					
(30) ...is clear and definite about the objectives of this course					
(31) ...knows the subject matter					

PLEASE USE THE OTHER SIDE OF THIS PAPER TO COMMENT ON THE FOLLOWING:

...what do you think are the particular strengths of this instructor?

...what would you suggest to this instructor as areas needing improvement?

COMMENTARY FORM

Cooperative Internship Program, 1970-71

Instructors: Please comment in the space provided. Think in terms of the interns work throughout the year, indicate changes or trends as they seem relevant.

1. Relations with Students:

2. Relations with Faculty:

3. Relations with Community:

4. Subject Matter Control:

5. Instructional Techniques:

6. Attitudes Toward Innovation and Improvement:

COMMENTARY FORM

7. Please comment on the intern in the areas of growth and improvement, areas needing improvement, and areas of strength.

8. Taking other first year instructors as a reference group, where would you place the intern in general all around performance?

Definitely Poorer	Below	About the Same	Better	Definitely Outstanding

INTERN RATING FORM
COOPERATIVE INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

NAME OF THE INTERN:____(1-36)

NAME OF THE COLLEGE:_______________________________________(37-53)

1. How do you rate the intern in the following areas, when the intern is compared with other instructors who have been teaching at your college the same length of time?

		much less	less	about the same	more	much more
(54)	Command of the subject matter					
(55)	Interest in innovation and experimentation					
(56)	Participation in the affairs of the college					
(57)	Participation in community activities					
(58)	Acceptance by faculty and administration					
(59)	Potential for growth as an instructor					
(60)	Awareness of the community college as a unique institution					
(61)	Understanding of students					
(62)	Ability to work with students					
(63)	Acceptance by students					

2. Are there other areas, not included above, that you would like to comment upon?

3. From your viewpoint, has the CIP influenced the intern's performance as an instructor? In what ways?

APPENDIX K

Interview Protocols; Evaluation of Process Weekend

EVALUATION ON PAJARO DUNES WEEKEND

I. How did you feel about the weekend, in advance?

a. Did you want to go /not want to /neutral/ apprehensive etc.?

b. Did you feel you had a good idea of what was going to occur?

c. Did you feel you understood the purpose of the weekend?

d. Did you agree with the purpose (as you perceived it?)

 1) if not, what were your desires?

e. Did you seriously consider not attending?

 1) if so, what finally brought you to the point of decision?

f. Did you see a possible relationship to your teaching/counseling?

II. How did you feel about the activities of the weekend as you were involved?

a. As the thing unfolded how were you feeling?

III. What results do you perceive for you?

a. How do you feel about yourself after the weekend?

 1) Is this different from how you felt before the weekend?

 2) In what way?

b. How do you feel about your relationships with others after the weekend?

 1) Is this different from how you felt before the weekend?

 2) In what way?

c. How do you feel about your teaching after the weekend?

 1) Is this different from how you felt before the weekend?

 2) In what way?

IV. Critical Changes

a. Do you perceive any personal changes?

b. Can you describe any incidents which illustrate effects of the weekend?

c. Can you describe any incidents specific to roles as teacher (counselor) which illustrate effects of the weekend?

V. Feelings about the weekend

a. In retrospect, how do you feel about the experience--was it valuable/ helpful/ negative/ neutral, etc.

b. Do you feel in tune with the goals?

c. Do you agree with them?

d. Do you feel the experience was helpful/negative/neutral in achieving them?

e. How do you feel about the participants?

    1) The staff?

    2) How do you feel about those who did not take part?

VI. Projective Concerns

a/ Is this a useful/ essential/ not useful/ negative feature of teacher training?

b. How could it be improved?

    1) timing, length, position?

    2) size of groups?

    3) arrangement ?source of participants

    4) organization

    5) staff personnel

    6) Should interns have ahd more (or less) role in planning for the weekend?

c. Should it be repeated for our group?

d. Should it be an ongoing experience for teachers?

e. Have you had any prior group experience?

    1) How did this weekend compare with others you've participated in?

Anything else?

APPENDIX L

Summary: Participant Assessment of 1970-71 CIP Group Process Training Weekend

SUM Y

PARTICIPANT ASSESSMENT OF 1970-71
CIP GROUP PROCESS TRAINING WEEKEND

PARTICIPANT CATEGORY	HOW DID YOU ANTICIPATE THE EXPERIENCE	WHAT WAS THE MOST IMPORTANT RESULT	WHAT CHANGES WOULD YOU RECOMMEND?	IS THIS AN ESSENTIAL PART OF TEACHER TRAINING?
	A) Hostility. Negative feelings, apprehension B) Neutral. Went along because part of CIP C) Positive. Looking forward to it	Personal growth. New insights about personality. Positive feelings. None. Didn't expect much, nothing happened. Disappointment. Goals not realized	Longer time. Repeat. Self-directed groups. More recreation. Non-white facilitators. More cognitive, less encounter.	Yes Ok, but not essential No, or don't know
	Positively, with some anxiety. Mostly about working with non-white groups.	Building of feelings community in group. Finding ability to be comfortable with minority group. Helping self discovery.	Longer session. Spread two weekends. More intern involvement in planning. Make it more voluntary. More structure. Less structure.	Yes, or not sure
	Looking forward to it. Some anxiety ...will it be a productive experience, or just a rap session?	Seeing the process work for skeptical, or negative interns. Seeing interns open up.	Minority facilitators. Longer session. More careful match of group participants.	Yes
	Somewhat anxious about those who might not take part. Looking forward to it. Will it be a good thing?	Learning more about how groups work. Seeing some personal concerns dealt with. Watching new moves in classes result.	Some way to encourage those who missed to take part. More time.	Yes